

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK, WILFRED P. MUSTARD,
D. M. ROBINSON

VOLUME LI

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD

PARIS: ALBERT FONTENOING

LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

1930

B

C

T

A

R

R

General
Wahr

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LI.

No. 201.

	PAGE
Bucephalus and His Legend. By ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON, -	1
When Did Alexander Reach the Hindu Kush? By C. A. ROBINSON, JR., -	22
The Figure ΑΔTNATON in Greek and Latin Poetry. By H. V. CANTER, -	32
Die altnordische Senkung <i>i</i> : <i>ü</i> > <i>ē</i> : <i>ō</i> vor <i>kk</i> , <i>pp</i> und <i>tt</i> (aus * <i>nk</i> , * <i>mp</i> , * <i>nt</i> assimiliert). By A. M. STUETEVANT, -	42
Two Misunderstood Passages in Aeschylus. By J. E. HARRY, -	51
Predicating Periods in Latin. By H. C. NUTTING, -	57
A Yale Papyrus and a Reconsideration of the Chronology of the Year 238 A. D. By P. W. TOWNSEND, -	62
The Authenticity of Letter 41 in the Julio-Basilian Correspondence. By SISTER AGNES CLARE WAY, C. D. P., -	67
Livy and Festus on the Tribus Pupinia. By TENNEY FRANK, -	70
REPORTS:	72
Rheinisches Museum, LXXVI (1927) (ROBERT PARVIN STRICKLER).—Romania, Vol. LIV (1928), janv.-avril (GEORGE C. KEIDEL).	
REVIEWS:	80
S. B. Platner's A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome (TENNEY FRANK).—Edgar Finley Shannon's Chaucer and the Roman Poets (ELIZABETH H. HAIGHT).—Christian Jensen's Menandri reliquiae in papyris et membranis servatae (L. A. POST).—Otto Weinreich's Studien zu Martial (JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.).—A. E. Taylor's A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus (CAROL V. B. WIGHT).—Louis Jalabert et René Mouterde's Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie (WILLIAM K. PRENTICE).	
BOOKS RECEIVED,	80

No. 202.

Chariton and His Romance from a Literary-Historical Point of View. By B. E. PERRY, -	93
The <i>Lex Lutatia</i> and the <i>Lex Plautia De Vi</i> . By JOHN N. HOUGH, -	135
Authorship of the Ciris. By R. B. STEELE, -	148
REPORTS:	185
Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, LVII (1929) (W. P. MUSTARD).—Mnemosyne, LVII (1929) (C. M. HALL).—Glotta XVIII (1930), 3/4 (ROLAND G. KENT).	
REVIEWS:	193
William A. Heidel's The Day of Yahweh (ERNST RIESS).—Liechtenhan's Anthimi De Observatione Ciborum (W. A. HEIDEL).—Raeder's Oribasii Collectionum Medi-	

	PAGE
corum Reliquiae, I (W. A. HEIDEL).— <i>Mozley's Ovid: The Art of Love and Other Poems</i> (W. P. MUSTARD).— <i>Vellay's Les nouveaux aspects de la question de Troie</i> (F. P. JOHNSON).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	202
 No. 203.	
Tradition in the Epithalamium. By ARTHUR L. WHEELER, - - - - -	205
On the Use of the Term "Ellipsis". By H. C. NUTTING, - - - - -	224
Lucretius and Thomson's Autumnal Fogs. By GERTRUDE GREENE CRONK, - - - - -	233
Michael Walpole, Translator of Boethius' <i>De Consolatione</i> . By WALTER E. HOUGHTON, JR., - - - - -	243
Appropriations for the Games at Rome in 51 A. D. By WILLIAM M. GREEN, - - - - -	249
Hittite and Indo-European Nominal Plural Declension. By WALTER PETERSEN, - - - - -	251
Vocalic Alternation in the Disyllabic Base in Indo-European. By LOUIS H. GRAY, - - - - -	273
The Name Πορειδάων and Other Names Ending in -aww in the Iliad. By GRACE H. MACURDY, - - - - -	286
REPORTS: - - - - -	289
Hermes LXIV (1929) (HERMAN LOUIS EBELING).— <i>Revue de Philologie</i> , Troisième Série, I (1927) (CAROL V. B. WIGHT).	
REVIEWS: - - - - -	303
E. K. Rand's Studies in the Script of Tours (TENNEY FRANK).— <i>Symbolae Osloenses</i> (WALTER W. HYDE).—Emil Goldmann's Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache (ROLAND G. KENT).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	309
 No. 204.	
Roman Census Statistics from 508 to 225 B. C. By TENNEY FRANK, - - - - -	313
Vergil and Pollio. By HAROLD BENNETT, - - - - -	325
Particularism in the Roman Empire during the Military Anarchy. By C. E. VAN SICKLE, - - - - -	343
A New Method of Investigating the Caesura in Latin Hexameter and Pentameter. By PHILIP B. WHITEHEAD, - - - - -	358
Medea's Waxing Wrath. By J. E. HARRY, - - - - -	372
The Text of Two Sources for Campanian Topography. By A. W. VAN BUREN, - - - - -	378
REPORTS: - - - - -	382
Mnemosyne, Vol. LVIII (1929), 1-2 (CLAYTON M. HALL).—Romania, Vol. LIV (1928), juillet-octobre (GEORGE C. KEIDEL).—Glotta, Vol. XIX (1930), 1-2 (ROLAND G. KENT).	

CONTENTS.

v

	PAGE
REVIEWS: - - - -	389
Léon Herrmann's Les Masques et les Visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile (W. P. MUSTARD).—J. F. Mountford and J. T. Schultz's Index Rerum et Nominum in Scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati Tractatorum (ID.).—Augusto Rostagni's Arte Poetica di Orazio (ID.).—Vincenzo Ussani's Storia della Letteratura Latina nelle Età Repubblicana e Augustea (ID.).—Anna Cox Brinton's Maphaeus Vegius and his Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid (ID.).—Anna Cox Brinton's Descensus Averno (ID.).—Louis Hastings Naylor's Chateaubriand and Virgil (ID.).—George B. Ives's The Essays of Montaigne (GEORGE BOAS).—Franciscus Novotny's Platonis Epistulae Commentariis Illustratae (L. A. POST).—Julius Jüthner's Körperfunktion im Altertum (WALTER WOOD-BURN HYDE).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - -	398
INDEX, - - - -	401

3
5
3
58
72
78
82

E
A

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

APR 7 1930

VOL. LI, 1

WHOLE NO. 201

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK, WILFRED P. MUSTARD,
D. M. ROBINSON

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH

1930

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under
the Act of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October
3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Bucephalus and His Legend. By ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON,	1
When Did Alexander Reach the Hindu Kush? By C. A. ROBINSON, JR.,	22
The Figure ΑΔΤΝΑΤΟΝ in Greek and Latin Poetry. By H. V. CANTER,	32
Die altnordische Senkung <i>i</i> : <i>ü</i> > <i>ē</i> : <i>ō</i> vor <i>kk</i> , <i>pp</i> und <i>tt</i> (aus * <i>nk</i> , * <i>mp</i> , * <i>nt</i> assimiliert). By A. M. STURTEVANT,	42
Two Misunderstood Passages in Aeschylus. By J. E. HARRY,	51
Predicating Periods in Latin. By H. C. NUTTING,	57
A Yale Papyrus and a Reconsideration of the Chronology of the Year 238 A. D. By P. W. TOWNSEND,	62
The Authenticity of Letter 41 in the Julio-Basilian Correspondence. By SISTER AGNES CLARE WAY, C. D. P.,	67
Livy and Festus on the Tribus Pupinia. By TENNEY FRANK,	70
REPORTS:	72
Rheinisches Museum, LXXVI (1927), (ROBERT PARVIN STRICKLER).—Romania, Vol. LIV (1928), janv.-avril (GEORGE C. KEIDEL).	80
REVIEWS:	
S. B. Platner's A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome (TENNEY FRANK).—Edgar Finley Shannon's Chaucer and the Roman Poets (ELIZABETH H. HAIGHT).—Christian Jensen's Menandri reliquiae in papyris et membranis servatae (L. A. POST).—Otto Weinreich's Studien zu Martial (JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.).—A. E. Taylor's A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus (CAROL V. B. WIGHT).—Louis Jalabert et René Mouterde's Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie (WILLIAM K. PRENTICE).	80
BOOKS RECEIVED:	89

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 25 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.





AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LI, 1

WHOLE No. 201

BUCEPHALAS AND HIS LEGEND.

[For contents see the section headings.]

Bucephalus and Alexander are a unique combination, the outstanding instance of a horse and a man that have attained to fame both in history and romance. Bucephalus indeed has certain advantages over horses like Pegasus, or Areion, or those of Laomedon,¹ or those of Diomede with which he may be compared; for these have become altogether mythical, and attempts to reconstruct them in reality are likely to be futile, even though descendants of the last mentioned, those of Diomede, are credited with being in existence at a time as late as that of Alexander the Great or even later.² In the case of Bucephalus however the essential facts can be established with considerable assurance, and starting from these we may see the myth in the making; for the legends of Alexander and Bucephalus have acted and reacted powerfully upon each other at important junctures of the story, especially that of Alexander upon that of Bucephalus. To such an extent has this gone that Bucephalus became the equine counterpart of Alexander, and even within Alexander's lifetime their birth was synchronized—a fiction usually regarded as a fact—and some of the later versions of the Alexander Romance actually synchronized their death.

Our chief sources of information concerning Bucephalus are Plutarch, *Alexander*, 6, and Arrian, *Anabasis*, V, 19, both of which passages I cite entire.

Plutarch, *Alexander*, 6:

Once upon a time Philoneicus the Thessalian brought Bucephalus, offering to sell him to Philip for thirteen

¹ Cf. *Hist. Alex. Magn.* I, 13.

² Diod. 4, 15; Gavius Bassus ap. Gell. 3, 9.

talents, and they went down into the plain to try the horse, who appeared to be savage and altogether intractable, neither allowing anyone to mount him, nor heeding the voice of any of Philip's attendants, but rearing up against all of them. Then Philip was vexed and ordered the horse to be led away, believing him to be altogether wild and unbroken; but Alexander, who was near by, said: "What a horse they are losing, because, for lack of skill and courage, they cannot manage him!" At first then Philip held his peace; but as Alexander many times let fall such words and showed great distress, he said: "Dost thou find fault with thine elders in the belief that thou knowest more than they do, or art better able to manage a horse?" "This horse, at any rate," said Alexander, "I could manage better than others have." "And if thou shouldst not, what penalty wilt thou undergo for thy rashness?" "Indeed," said Alexander, "I will forfeit the price of the horse." There was laughter at this, and then an agreement between father and son as to the forfeiture, and at once Alexander ran to the horse, took hold of his bridle-rein, and turned him toward the sun; for he had noticed as it would seem, that the horse was greatly disturbed by the sight of his own shadow falling in front of him and dancing about. And after he had calmed the horse a little in this way, and had stroked him with his hand, when he saw that he was full of spirit and courage, he quietly cast aside his mantle, and with a light spring safely bestrode him. Then with a little pressure of the reins on the bit, and without striking him or tearing his mouth, he held him in hand; but when he saw that the horse was rid of the fear that had beset him, and was impatient for the course, he gave him his head, and at last urged him on with sterner tone and thrust of foot. Philip and his company were speechless with anxiety at first; but when Alexander made the turn in proper fashion and came back towards them proud and exultant, all the rest broke into loud cries, but his father, as we are told, actually shed tears of joy, and when Alexander had dismounted, kissed him, saying: "My son, seek thee a kingdom equal to thyself; Macedonia has not room for thee."³

This description seems to be in the main authentic. To see, as Deonna does,⁴ in Alexander's act of turning him toward the sun and of casting aside his mantle, the proof that he was one of

³ An abridgment of this passage is found in Zonaras, IV, 8 (vol. I, 331, 2 ff. Pinder).

⁴ Deonna, *Rev. d. Et. Gr.* XXXI (1918), 78, quoted on p. 19.

the horses of the sun is to detect symbolism where none exists. If the authenticity of any part of it were to be questioned, it would be Philip's words at the end, which in reality are in embryo the legend which has reached maturity in the *Hist. Alex. Magn.* I, 15, 17 which I shall quote and discuss on pp. 17 ff.

Arrian, Anabasis, V, 19:

Alexander founded two cities, one where the battle took place, and the other on the spot whence he started to cross the river Hydaspes; the former he named Nicaea, after his victory over the Indians, and the latter Bucephala in memory of his horse Bucephalus, which died there, not from having been wounded by anyone, but from the effects of toil and old age: for he was about thirty years old, and quite worn out with toil.⁵ This Bucephalus had shared many hardships and incurred many dangers with Alexander during many years, being ridden by none but the king, because he rejected all other riders. He was both of unusual size and generous in mettle. The head of an ox had been engraved upon him as a distinguishing mark, and according to some this was the reason that he bore this name; but others say, that though he was black he had a white mark upon his forehead which bore a great resemblance to the head of an ox. In the land of the Uxians this horse vanished from Alexander, who thereupon sent a proclamation throughout the country that he would kill all the inhabitants unless they brought the horse back to him. And as a result of this proclamation it was immediately brought back. So great was Alexander's attachment to the horse, and so great was the fear of Alexander entertained by the barbarians. Let so much honor be paid by me to this Bucephalus for the sake of his master.

*The Name Bucephalus: its Origin, Significance and History
in the Legend.*

The various explanations of the origin and application of the name Bucephalus are given as follows:

- (1) That it was the name of a famous breed of horses from Thessaly branded with the sign of an ox's head on the thigh or shoulder, and that Alexander's horse was of this breed and became par excellence *Bucephalus*. Such is the expla-

⁵ Onesicritus was authority for the statement that Bucephalus was thirty years of age at death, and that he died from the effects of toil and old age (*Plut. Alex.* 61, quoted later p. 10).

nation given by *Etym. Magn.* 207, 50 ff. (*Etym. Gud.* 113, 41 ff.) :

βουκέφαλος ὁ ἵππος, ὃν Ἀλεξάνδρος ἐκέκτητο οὐχ ὡς τινες οἴονται ὅτι βοὸς κέρατα εἶχε· τοῦτο γὰρ ψευδές· ἐκοσμέστο γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου χρυσοῦς (*Gud.* adnectit: κέρασι καὶ ἄλλῳ βασιλικῷ κόσμῳ)· καὶ οὐ διὰ τὰ κέρατα βουκέφαλος ὀνόμασται, ἀλλ’ ὅτι οὗτος ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ ἐκαλούντο οἱ ἵπποι ἔχοντες ἐγκεκαυμένον βουκράνιον. ὅτι δὲ τῶν Θεσσαλικῶν ἵπποι τινὲς ἐκαλούντο βουκέφαλοι δῆλοι Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Ἀναγύρῳ (fr. 41 Kock) ·

μὴ κλᾶ· ἔγω σοι βουκέφαλον ὀνήσομαι.
καὶ πάλιν (fr. 42) ·

Ψῆχ' ἡρέμα τὸν βουκέφαλον καὶ τὸν κοππατίαν.
λέγεται (βουκέφαλος) δέ γκεχαραγμένον ἔχων τοῖς ισχίοις βουκρανον.

Similarly the scholiast to Aristophanes, *Nub.* 23 (and also Suidas, s. v. *κοππατίας*) :

οὐδὲ γὰρ βουκεφάλας καλοῦμεν διὰ τὸ μορφὴν τοιαύτην ἔχειν,
ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ οὗτο κεχαράχθαι· οἷος, οἷμαι, καὶ ὁ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου
τοῦ Μακεδόνος ἵππος ἦν, φ τελευτήσαντι τὴν βουκεφάλειαν Ἀλέξανδρος [rectius τὴν βουκέφαλον Ἀλεξάνδρειαν Suidas] ἐκτισεν,
ἐντάφιον αὐτῷ τῆς ἀρετῆς χαριζόμενος πόλιν.

The same general explanation is given by Arrian, *Anab.* V, 19, 5 along with (2), the whole passage quoted above on p. 3; by *Excerpta Vaticana*, no. 183 (Sternbach in *Wiener Studien*, XVI (1894), 9), which clearly goes back to Arrian or to the same source as Arrian; Pliny, *N.H.* VIII, 154, which gives this explanation as alternative with (2); Solinus 45, 8 which gives this along with (3) and (4); Tzetzes, *Chil.* I, 810 ff. which at the same time rejects (4) and (5) :

τοῦ Βουκεφάλου (-α?) σύμπασαν ἔχεις τὴν ιστορίαν,
ὡς ἵππος ἦν ἀτίθασσος ἀνθρώπους κατεσθίων.
μόνω δὲ Μακεδόνι δὲ ὑπείκων Ἀλεξάνδρῳ·
τὴν Βουκεφάλα κλῆσιν δὲ τοιουτορόπως ἔσχε.
βοὸς ὡς ἔχων κεφαλὴν ἐν τῷ μηρῷ σφραγίδα,
οὐ μὴν βοὸς ἐκέκτητο ἦ κεφαλὴν ἦ κέρας.

A variant version of that given by Tzetzes is found incorporated as a lemma in the Byzantine version, Wagner, *Trois Poèmes Grecs*, following 773:

Τοῦ Βουκεφάλου σύμπασαν μάθε τὴν ἱστορίαν·
ώς ἵππος ἦν ἀτίθασσος ἀνθρώπους κατεσθίων,
μόνῳ τῷ Μακεδόνι δ' οὐν ὑπείκων Ἀλεξάνδρῳ.
τὴν Βουκεφάλου κλῆσιν δὲ τοιουτοτρόπως ἔχει.
βοὸς γὰρ εἶχε κεφαλὴν ἐν τῷ μηρῷ σφρηγίδα,
οὐ μὴν βοὸς ἐκέτητο κεφάλιον καὶ κέρας.

Likewise the Recensio Vetusta of the Alexander Romance I, 15 has this explanation, and Julius Valerius emphasizes this by rejecting (4): Vocabatur enim equus quem supra diximus illo nomine non eo modo quod corniculata fronte terribilis foret, sed quod inustio etiam fortuita quaedam eius coxae veluti taurini capitis imitamen insederat. In the Syrian version the mark is not a brand, but a birth-mark in which a wolf holds an ox in his mouth. A curious perversion of the ox's head is found in Rudolf of Ems *Alexander*, 1993 ff. (see Zingerle, *Die Quellen zum Alexander des Rudolf von Ems*, p. 70):

Imē was gebrant an einē būg
Eines frōschēn houbet
Imē was ob ir es glöbet
Gewahsen ufs der stirnen sin
Ein gefüge hörnelin.

The metamorphosis of an ox's head into a frog's head is truly a masterpiece, and I quote with full approval Zingerle's explanation: "so halte ich dafür, dass der Frosch dem Kopfe des flüchtigen Abschreibers entsprungen ist, indem er 'ūrohsen', in seiner Vorlage vrochsen geschrieben, als vroschen las."

- (2) That he had in the middle of his forehead a white blaze that resembled an ox's head: Arrian, *Anab.* V, 19, 5 which also gives (1); *Excerpta Vaticana*, 183. This seems to be the explanation of the term as applied to the Kataghan breed of horses reputed to be descended from Bucephalas, see Sir Henry Yule, *the Book of Ser Marco Polo*, vol. I, 158, with N. 4, p. 162.

- (3) That he received the name ab aspectu torvo, Pliny, *N. H.* VIII, 154, who gives this view as alternative with (1); de aspectus torvitatem, Solinus, 45, 8, who gives this explanation along with (1) and (4); probably from the latter source this explanation found its way into the interpolated versions of Leo and the occidental versions based thereon, cf. Oswald Zingerle, *Die Quellen zum Alexander des Rudolf von Ems*, 140: dicebatur ipse equus Bucefalas propter aspectus torvitatem seu ab insignis (a binis signis?), quod taurinum caput in armo habebat ustum, seu (et?) quod de fronte eius quaedam mine corniculorum protuberabant. Cf. also Kinzel's edition of Lamprecht's *Alexander*, p. 45. Kinzel reprints the Strassburg edition of the *Historia de Prelis* with manuscript variants.
- (4) That he had a horn, or horns, or hornlike protuberances on his head. *Etym. Mag.* and *Etym. Gud.* reject the notion of horns by rejecting the plural, *κέρατα*; so also apparently Julius Valerius, I, 15; Tzetzes, *op. cit.* I, 815, and the lemma in Byz reject the notion of horns by rejecting the singular, *κέρας*. In the western versions the source of the horns seems to be Solinus 45, 8 corniculorum minae, who gives this explanation along with (1) and (3), and we find them in the French Prose Romances, Weismann, *Alexander*, vol. II, 383, *The Wars of Alexander*, ed. Skeat, *EETS.*, *ES.*, XLVII. 752*; *Prose Life of Alexander*, p. 9 (*EETS.*, 143, ed. Westlake). Bucephalus is several times represented with two horns in the Tournai Tapestry of the Palazzo Doria, Alinari 29737-29739. I mention incidentally that von Schwarz, *Alexanders d. Gr. Feldzüge in Turkestan*²,⁶ 99-100, proposed that Alexander's epithet Dulcarnain,

* H. Christensen, "Die Vorlage des byzantinischen Alexandergedichtes," in the *Sitzungsberichte d. philosophisch-philologischen und d. historischen Classe der k. b. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu München*, 1897, 116 and ftn. Christensen refers to the edition by Novakovic, Belgrade, 1878, and Wesselowski, *Sbornik der Petersb. Akad.* XL (1886), 152. The one horn appears in Thomas of Kent, 490 (Paul Meyer, *Alex. le Grand dans la Lit. Frang. du Moyen Âge*, I, 215); *Kyng Alisaunder*, 690 (ed. Weber in *Metrical Romances*, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1810); *Konung Alexander*, 543 (ed. Klemming, Stockholm, 1844-1862); Rudolf von

the Lord of Two Horns, was bestowed upon him from the fact that he rode a horse that was represented with two horns. Von Schwarz identified as Bucephalas the representation of a beautiful horse on a coin that he saw in Turkestan, which was held at too high a price for him to purchase. In the Pompeii mosaic one might be tempted to regard as a horn (white) what is almost certainly an ear. The rest of the horse is here black.

Quite unexpectedly however it is the unicorn conception of Bucephalas that predominates in the later versions, and here we make the manuscript C of the *Historia Alexandri Magni* I, 13, the point of departure, *θεασάμενος δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ μέγεθος Φίλιππος ὁ βασιλεύς, καὶ ὅτι βοὸς κεφαλὴν ἔχει (εἶχεν) ἐκτετυπωμένην ἐν τῷ δεξιῷ μηρῷ καὶ κέρας ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ, ἔθαύμασε.* Since the Serbian Alexander Romance was based on the C tradition, we would expect in addition to the brand of the ox's head on the right thigh also the single horn. However, according to the report of it given by Christensen, it gives "Hörner zwischen den Ohren."

It is interesting to note that in the French Prose Romance quoted by Weismann, *op. cit.* II, 375, the head of Bucephalas (Bull head) is like that of a marine bull with three horns: *li chevaus avoit nom Busifel, et avoit trois cornes, comme de tor marin.* Alfons Hilka, *der altfranzösische Prosa-Alexanderroman*, p. 35, 5 reads ".II. cornes."

- (5) That his head was like that of an ox, *et capite et nomine Bucephalas*, Gellius, V, 2; Festus 32 M propter quandam bubuli capitinis similitudinem. This view is rejected by the Schol. ad. Arist. *Nub.* 23 and by Tzetzes, *op. cit.* I, 811.
- (6) That it was from the breadth of his head, Strabo XV, 698, *ἀπὸ τοῦ πλάτους τοῦ μετώπου.* (4), (5), and (6) are different aspects of the same; these presuppose that the ox's head was that of Bucephalas, and they visualized it in the different forms and details indicated.

Ems, *Alexander*, 1997, quoted above, p. 5; Babiloth, *Alexanderchronik*, 15 (ed. Herzog, *die Alexanderchronik des Meister Babiloth*, Stuttgart, 1897, p. 45); Nobili Fatti (ed. Grion, Bologna, 1872), p. 16; cf. H. Christensen, *Beiträge zur Alexandersage* (Hamburg, 1883), 3.

The Origin of Bucephalus.

The following statements of the origin and pedigree of Bucephalus are given:

- (1) That he was of the herd of Philoneicus the Thessalian: Plut. *Alex.* 6; Pliny, *N. H.* VIII, 154; or merely of Thessalian origin, *Etym. Magn.* 207, 50 ff. with *Etym. Gud.* 113, 41 ff. both quoted on p. 4, cf. Tzetzes, *Chil.* IV, 490 ff. quoted on p. 4.
- (2) That he was foaled on the king's (Philip's) own estate, presumably when Alexander was not more than twelve years old. This is implied by the text of the Recensio Vetusta I, 13 end by ValArmB', Ethiop, and seems to have been transmitted into the legend of Caesar's horse, cf. Suet. *Jul.* 61 natum apud se, the whole passage quoted on p. 18.
- (3) That he was of Cappadocian breed brought by the prince or princes of Cappadocia as a present to Philip when Alexander was not more than twelve years old. Such is the account given in the *Historia Alex. Magn.* I, 13 end by ASyRLeo and from Leo passed down to most of the western versions: Pfaffe Lamprecht, *Basler Einleitung*, 535 ff. ed. Kinzel; *Konung Alexander*, 535 ff. French Prose Romances, Weismann, *op. cit.* II, 375, 383; Babiloth, *Alexanderchronik*, 15; *der Grosse Alexander*, ed. Guth, 347 ff. *The Wars of Alexander*, 742*.

Hartlieb, *das buch der geschicht des grossen alexanders*, ed. by Richard Benz, Jena, 1924, p. 18 has the following attractive adaptation of the Cappadocian origin of Bucephalus:

In den selben Zeiten war ein Fürst gesessen in Capadoccia, der war auch unterthan dem König Philippo von Macedonia, in des Land fiel gar ein fremd seltsam Tier, das war einem Pferd am meisten gleich, wiewohl es sonst gar ein fremde Gestalt hätt. Das Pferd hätt vornen Füss als ein Hirsch und einen langen Hals, einen Kopf als ein freisamer Leo; und es ass nur Menschen Fleisch. Das Thier schenkt der Fürst von Capadoccia dem König Philippo.

Rud. von Ems, 1978 ff. *Nobili Fatti*, p. 16. The Cappadocian origin of Bucephalus was given also in *Excerpta*

Vaticana, 202, Sternbach, *op. cit.* 9: Δημάρατος ὁ Κορίνθιος δέδωκεν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Βουκέφαλον ἵππον· Καππαδόξ δὲ ἦν. Solinus 45, 5-8 brings in his description of Bucephalus as an illustration of the Cappadocian breed of horses. I am not however able to persuade myself to agree with Sternbach and Kroll that this was the reading of the Recensio Vetusta, but feel with Ausfeld that this reading was either an intrusion or a corruption due perhaps to *kai* *ittopodokias*, see Ausfeld, *Der griechische Alexanderroman*, p. 37, 16).

- (4) That he was conceived of the same origin as Alexander and at the same time with Alexander. This general idea might have been deduced from Plut. *Alex.* 61 (Onesicritus), and also from Arrian *Anab.* V, 19, 4, both quoted on p. 10. It seems however that it was the lost Arabic version of the Alexander Romance, dated about the ninth century, that fully carried out the idea. This lost Arabic version seems to have been the source both of the extant Ethiopian version, published by Budge, *Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1896), the pertinent part of which is found in vol. II, pp. 18-19, where after the union of Olympias with Nectanebos as a result of which the world conqueror Alexander was conceived comes the following:

And it came to pass after he had said these things to her that Nectanebus went out from her to a fountain which was near to a temple of idols, and washed therein. And one of the king's mares came to the fountain and drank of its waters, and she became with foal straightway: now this took place at the exact time when the queen, the wife of Philip, conceived.

The synchronizing of the birth of Alexander and of Bucephalus is exploited also by Firdausi (Mohl's French trans. V, 45; for summary see Noeldeke, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alexanderromans*, p. 50; Spiegel, *Erânische Altertumskunde*, II, 585) according to whom Philip shrank from making public his daughter's rejection by Dara, and accordingly gave it out that Alexander was his own son; he considered it however an auspicious omen for the boy's future that on the night of his birth a mare in the royal stables had brought forth a remarkable foal.

- (5) That he was the offspring of an elephant and a dromedary, an explanation found in some of the mediaeval French versions cf. Paul Meyer, *Alexandre le Grand* etc. I, 57 where the *Manuscrit de l'Arsenal*, lxxiv reads—

Antigonus Bucifal li ameine,
Un bon destrer, unc ne mancha d'aveine.
Engendrez fu en l'isle de Miceine
D'un olifant e d'une dromedaine.

A variant decasyllabic version of similar content is found in the *Manuscrit de Venise*, *ibid.*, I, 269, lines 746 ff.

- (6) That he was the gift of the queen of Egypt to Philip, *Lambert li Tors*, ed. Michelant, p. 11, 3.
- (7) Rudolf von Ems 1988 ff. represents Bucephalus as a cross between a horse and a griffin, cf. Zingerle, *op. cit.*, 70: Keinen Aufschluss vermag ich über die Quelle zu V. 1988 ff. zu geben wonach Bucephal von Ross und Greifen abstammt wäre. Oder basiert das auf I. V. (I. V. Epit.) I, 14: aiuntque illum armenti quidem regalis genus (tum) forma tum pedibus ad Pegasi fabulam opinabilem.

Bucephalus, his Age and Death.

We know from Plutarch, *Al.* 61 that it was Onesicritus who was authority for the statement that Bucephalus was thirty years old at death, and that he died from the effects of toil and old age,—ἐκ δὲ τῆς πρὸς Πῶρον μάχης καὶ ὁ βουκεφάλας ἐτελεύτησεν, οὐκ εὐθὺς ἀλλ’ ὕστερον, ὡς οἱ πλεῖστοι λέγουσιν, ὑπὸ τραυμάτων θεραπευόμενος, ὡς δὲ Ὁνησίκριτος, διὰ γῆρας ὑπέρπονος γενόμενος τριάκοντα γὰρ ἐτῶν ἀποθανεῖν αὐτόν. Arrian, *Anab.* V, 19, 4 makes a similar statement without acknowledging his authority—εἰς τοῦ ἵππου τοῦ βουκεφάλου τὴν μνήμην, ὃς ἀπέθανεν αὐτοῦ, οὐ βληθεὶς πρὸς οὐδενὸς ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ καμάτου τε καὶ ἡλικίας· ἦν γὰρ ἀμφὶ τὰ τριάκοντα ἔτη, καματηρὸς γενόμενος. We should, however, take cognizance of the first part of the quotation from Plutarch given above as the testimony of *οἱ πλεῖστοι* as well as of the statement of Gellius, V, 2:

Equus Alexandri regis et capite et nomine 'Bucephalus' fuit. Emptum Chares (fr. 14, p. 117 M) talentis tredecim et regi Philippo donatum . . . Super hoc equo dignum

memoria visum, quod, ubi ornatus erat armatusque ad praelium, haud umquam inscendi sese ab alio nisi ab rege passus sit. Id etiam de isto equo memoratum est, quod, cum insidens in eo Alexander bello Indico et facinora faciens fortia in hostium cuneum non satis sibi providens inmisisset conjectisque undique in Alexandrum telis vulneribus altis in cervice atque in latere equus perfossus esset, moribundus tamen ac prope iam exsanguis e mediis hostibus regem vivacissimo cursu retulit atque, ubi eum extra tela extulerat, illico concidit et domini iam superstitis securus quasi cum sensus humani solacio animam exspiravit. Tum rex Alexander parta eius belli Victoria oppidum in isdem locis condidit idque ob equi honores 'Bucephalon' appellavit.

Concerning this it is only fair to say that if Alexander had really been carried into such extreme danger by Bucephalus in the battle of the Hydaspes, we should surely expect to have some further notice of the fact preserved from the contemporary historians of Alexander. In reality however, the nearest that we can come to substantiating it is to be found in the *Alexander Romance*, III, 3, where it is stated that Bucephalus was intercepted by Porus himself, and that he utterly collapsed, it being implied that he died on the field.

The statement of Onesicritus that Bucephalus died at the age of thirty years of exhaustion and old age should be tested by the statement of Plutarch, *Al.* 6, that it was Alexander who succeeded in breaking him. If Bucephalus was thirty years old at death, this would make him of practically even age with Alexander.⁷ To believe that he was from fourteen to seventeen years old when Alexander broke him tests our credulity. It therefore seems preferable to regard Bucephalus as about ten years younger than Alexander. Indeed the *Alexander Romance* represents Alexander as fourteen years of age when he broke Bucephalus, I, 17. We are therefore constrained to prefer the first part of the statement of Plutarch as cited above ἐκ δὲ τῆς πρὸς Πόρον μάχης καὶ ὁ βουκεφάλας ἐτελεύτησεν, οὐκ εὐθὺς ἀλλ'

⁷ Schmieder says: "Alexander could not have broken in the horse before he was sixteen years old. But since at this time he was in his twenty-ninth year, he would have had him thirteen years. Consequently the horse must have been about seventeen years old when he acquired him. Can anyone believe this?"

ἢτερον, ὡς οἱ πλεῖστοι λέγουσιν, ὑπὸ τραυμάτων θεραπευόμενος: and that his age at death was about twenty years.⁸

The historical Bucephalus may be described somewhat as follows: He was of the Thessalian breed of horses of that name and of the herd of Philoneicus, having been bought at the price of thirteen talents *perhaps* by Demaratus⁹ of Corinth as a present to Philip or indirectly to Alexander. The horse was large and beautiful, black except for a white blaze on his forehead. On his thigh or shoulder he bore the brand of an ox's head, hence his name. He was fiery, spirited and proud. Only Alexander understood him and succeeded in riding him. At the siege of Thebes he was wounded. Alexander rode him in all his battles in Asia. At one time he was lost, either among the Hyrcanians (*Plut. Alex.* 44), or among the nearby Mardians (*Curtius*, VI, 17-18; *Diodorus*, XVII, 76, 5 ff. where however the name of the horse needs to be supplied), or among the Uxians (*Arrian, Anab.* V, 19), whereat Alexander threatened the most severe reprisals if he were not immediately returned unharmed. He died as a result of wounds received at the battle of the Hydaspes, and in his memory Alexander founded a city, Bucephala, at the crossing of the Hydaspes.

In contemporary art Bucephalus seems to have been portrayed by Lysippus in his famous group entitled Alexander with the Lance; cf. *Plut. de fortitudine Alexandri*, II, 2, p. 335 B; *de Is. et Os.* 24, p. 360 D; *Himerius, Or. XIV*, 14; *Ecl. 31*, 2; *Choricius*, p. 173 Förster.

Bucephalus in the Alexander Romance.

I, 13 The grooms bring to Philip a colt foaled on the royal estate, of exceeding size and in beauty and speed surpassing Pegasus and Areion. When to his chagrin Philip is told that he is a man-eater, he directs that he be put in an iron-

⁸ For the synchronizing of the death of Bucephalus with that of Alexander, see the *Alexander Romance*, III, 33, the reading of C summarized below, p. 15. See also Noeldeke, *op. cit.* 55, with ftn. 2.

⁹ The statement of Diodorus, XVII, 76, 6, that *(Bucephalus)* was a present made by Demaratus of Corinth is by Käerst in Pauly-Wissowa, III, 995, 53 ff., regarded as a mistake. Berve, however, *Alexanderreich*, II, no. 253, regards the statement of Diodorus as true.

grated cage, and that there be thrown to him criminals condemned for piracy or murder.

The statement of ASyrLeo that the prince or princes of Cappadocia brought the horse as a present to Philip—a statement of the origin of Bucephalus agreeing with that found in Solinus 45, 5 ff. and *Excerpta Vaticana* 202, and erroneously accepted by Sternbach and by Kroll—can scarcely be anything but a corruption or an intrusion. It is far easier to explain it thus, than to explain its omission from the other MSS, such as ArmValB'. In addition to the explanation of the name Bucephalus given by the Recensio Vetusta, that it was due to the brand of an ox's head on the horse's right thigh, C gives also the explanation that he had a horn on his head, see above p. 7.

I. 15 Philip sending to the Delphic oracle to find out who his successor is to be, receives the response that whosoever shall ride the wild horse Bucephalus through the streets of Pella shall not only be his successor but become cosmocrator besides—subduing all the world with his spear. (It is explained that such was the name of the colt mentioned in I, 13, and that he received the name from the brand of an ox's head on his thigh.) Philip expected the coming of *a new Heracles*.

The conception that Bucephalus was a man-eater—which is found also in Tzetzes, *Chil.* 811, quoted above p. 4—and that Philip on hearing the oracle expected a new Heracles shows that the myth-maker thought of the horses of Diomedes as Bucephalus's prototype. Syr does not in this passage provide that the successful rider shall also be world conqueror.

I, 17 Alexander passing near the iron cage hears a terrific snorting and inquires whether it was the whinnying of a horse or the roaring of a lion. Bucephalus on hearing Alexander's voice whinnies softly, reaches out his front legs, and fawns upon him as a dog fawns upon his master. Thereupon Alexander enters the cage after elbowing aside the guards and rides Bucephalus through the streets of Pella to the great delight of Philip who then acclaims him *κοσμοκράτωρ*.

The significance of the oracle that the one who rides

Bucephalas shall become cosmocrator will be duly brought out later. Quite apart from this let me point out that Bucephalas became sufficiently mythical to act like a dog —ut cum quando blanditur domino suo canis, sic et ille blandiebat Alexandro, Leo.¹⁰ From Léo this conception passed into the western versions, and perhaps reminiscences of it are to be found in art also, cf. Carraroli, *La Leggenda di Alessandro Magno*, 362: In una chiesa romana di Lione, riparata nel periodo gotico, v'era un medaglione che portava un animale alquanto simile a un cane; il quale però, secondo che attestava l'iscrizione sottostante, doveva rappresentare il cavallo di Alessandro, Bucefale. Prosper Mérimée, *Notes d'un Voyage dans le Midi de la France*, 92. Cf. also Hartlieb, *ed. cit.*, 18. Syr in its equivalent passage, I, 16, explains the name Bucephalas as due to the fact that Alexander "saw upon the right side of the horse a birthmark in the form of a wolf, a sign that was born with him, and this wolf held a bull in his mouth".

I, 19 Syr and Byz could not resist the temptation to make Alexander take Bucephalas along with him to the Olympian games, and making a race-horse of him. They also exploited his man-eating qualities by making Bucephalas bite Alexander's competitors during the race.

II, 9 Syr gives: "Then Alexander clad in armor came at the head of the Macedonians, and he was riding upon the horse called Bucephalus, which no man dared to approach, for the power of the gods was upon him."

II, 19 Darius in a letter to Porus in which he asks his aid against Alexander promises to bestow Bucephalas upon him as part of his reward for contributing to Alexander's defeat.

III, 3 Bucephalus falls, wounded by Porus. Alexander disregards the battle, drags Bucephalus to himself lest he be taken away by the enemy.

Syr gives: "The horse which was called Bucephalus, upon which Alexander rode, by the sorcery of Porus threw Alexander off his back. Then by reason of this Alexander was in great tribulation, and he went on foot, holding and leading with his hand the horse which was called Bull-head, for he thought: 'Peradventure he may fall into the hand of the enemies.'"

¹⁰ I have elsewhere proposed the emendation of the Greek manuscripts: ὡς τῷ ιδίῳ δέσπότῃ ὑποσαλνων (MSS ὑποφαλνων). See *A. J. P. L* (1929), 193 f.

C, after telling of the death of Bucephalus as related in the Recensio Vetusta, speaks of the clash of battle being renewed, and of the Indians surrounding Alexander and of Providence saving him through his having mounted Bucephalus!

III, 33 C takes the opportunity of synchronizing the death of the horse with that of the master. Accordingly he makes Charmedes say: "Thou, too, unfortunate as Pegasus hast undone another Bellerophon; but greater than Bellerophon is Alexander. Ah me, with what eyes could one look upon Bucephalus with another to ride and mount him!" Later as Bucephalus stood before him Alexander said: "Thou wert born to share my fortune and misfortune; for in wars I had thee as my fellow-combatant, but in this death-dealing war thou dost not join me, but methinks that thou wouldest gladly come to my aid but canst not." When Alexander had said this in tears to Bucephalus, the whole host raised a wail of lamentation. The guileful slave who had prepared the poison, hearing this wail thought that it signified that Alexander was dead, and came running in to behold. Whereat Bucephalus ran up, seized him with his teeth, and, as if to execute the vengeance of Alexander, leaped high in air and tore the slave in pieces. Then raising himself and whinnying gently before Alexander he fell before him and breathed his last. (See Mueller's text and collations on pp. 98 and 150.)

III, 35 Mention is made of Alexandria, quae condita est nomine Bucephalae equi. (Val)

The Ethiopian Version.

The outstanding feature of the Ethiopian version concerning Bucephalus was that the horse was represented as a mare whose conception and birth synchronized with that of Alexander. This synchronizing of their birth, which is found also in Firdausi, was probably copied from some common source, probably from the lost Arabic version, and probably from the same source also was derived the notion that Bucephalus was a mare.¹¹ It remained for the Ethiopian version to take the final step however, which was to represent Alexander and Bucephalus as begotten from the same seed; for after the union of Olympias with

¹¹ See above, p. 9, under the *Origin of Bucephalus* (4), and also Budge, *op. cit.*, II, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii and ftn. on the latter page.

Nectanebos as a result of which the world conqueror Alexander was conceived, comes the following (Budge, *op. cit.*, II, 18) :

p. 18 "And it came to pass after he had said these things to her that Nectanebos went out from her to a fountain which was near to a temple of idols, and washed therein. And one of the king's mares came to the fountain and drank of its waters, and she became with foal straightway: now this took place at the exact time when the queen, the wife of Philip, conceived."

p. 35 (corresponding to I, 23) To the ambassadors that had come from Darius to Philip to collect the tribute Alexander says:

"And further I myself will come unto him in a very short time, and I will avenge myself upon him with my army, and I will ride upon my horse which was begotten with me."

(This was before Alexander had broken the mare, and in fact before the events next to be narrated came to pass!)

pp. 37-8 (corresponding to I, 13, 15, 17) :

"And there was in the house of Philip a mare which was begotten with Alexander, and it fell out that no one could draw nigh unto her, and no one could mount her, for she was exceedingly strong and powerful, and she was bound by day and by night with seven fetters. Now when Alexander knew what his father wished to do with him in the matter of sending him to Darius, the king of Persia, he went down from his chamber, and girded on his sword, and cut through the fetters which held the mare; then he leaped upon her back, and fled while his father was looking on. And Philip cried out, 'My son hath let loose the mare.' And it came to pass that when he had done thus with the mare, his father sent horsemen after him to bring him back to him; for in one hour he had travelled a distance of three hundred stadia; and when the messengers saw the rate at which he went, they turned back from following him. Then Alexander also turned back and delivered the mare to one of his servants, saying: 'Take good care of her, for she belongeth to me, and she will be with me on my travels.' Then his father Philip went down and embraced him, and set him upon the throne, and spake to him, saying: 'The kingdom should by right be thine, O my son, and thou art he of whom the queen and the wise men spake when they said that thou shouldst rule over all the earth.' And he delivered unto him the key of the palace."

p. 89 (corresponding to II, 11) Darius makes no specific mention of Bucephalus in his letter to Porus.

pp. 121-22 (corresponding to III, 3) :

"Then Porus, the king of India, called the magicians from the temple of his god and they cast a spell upon Alexander, and his mare rose up under him and threw him on the ground, and she refused to rise up until he could lead her; now she was the mare which had by sorcery been born at the same time with himself . . . and as he went (encouraging his soldiers) he led his horse, and he did so because he feared lest she should be carried off by the enemy."

The Taming of Bucephalus and the Oracle of World-Empire.

It is a striking fact that the oracle of the Gordian Knot and the story of its cutting by Alexander is not utilized in the Alexander Romance. When however it is borne in mind that a prophecy centering in Phrygia and emanating from Phrygia would be utterly extraneous, and could not in the very nature of things be exploited by a writer whose hero was the offspring of Olympias and Ammon impersonated by Nectanebos, it becomes evident that the background for such prophecies must be sought either in Egypt or in Greece. Carraroli actually supposes that there was in Macedonia an ancient oracle promising the royal crown to him who would succeed in breaking Bucephalus.¹² That there was such an oracle may well be doubted. In fact the steps in the growth of the legend are to be followed with sufficient clearness. After Alexander had succeeded in riding Bucephalus, Plutarch, *Alex.* 6 end, represents Philip as saying:

"Ο παῖ," φάναι "ζήτει σεαυτῷ βασιλείαν ἵσην· Μακεδονίᾳ γάρ σε οὐ χωρεῖ."

Prophecies of world empire are generally made up *ex eventu*, and the next step is to be found in the *Historia Alexandri Magni* I, 15:

ὅς Φίλιππος . . . ἔπειμψεν εἰς Δελφοὺς χρησμὸν λαμβάνειν, τίς ἄρα μετ' αὐτὸν βασιλεύσει. τούτῳ δὲ ἡ Δελφικὴ Πυθία γεν-
σαμένη τοῦ Κασταλίου νάματος χθονίου οὔτως εἶπεν· "Φίλιππε,
ἐκεῖνος ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης βασιλεύσει καὶ δόρατι πάντας ὑποτάξει,
ὅστις τὸν Βουκέφαλον ἵππον ἐπιβὰς διὰ μέσης τῆς Πέλλης
διοδεύσει. (Arm)

¹² Carraroli, *la leggenda di Alessandro Magno*, 292.

and in I, 17, where Alexander rides Bucephalus and is in consequence acclaimed world conqueror by his father:

ὅ δὲ (Φίλιππος) ὑπομνησθεὶς καὶ ἐνθυμηθεὶς τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγονότα διάγνησε τῷ νιῷ αὐτοῦ ἀσπασάμενος αὐτὸν καὶ εἰπε·
“Κοσμοκράτορ Ἀλέξανδρε, χαιροῖς.” (Arm)

The foregoing passages have never as far as I know been used in connection with certain related passages dealing with a similar prophecy affecting Julius Caesar which I shall now quote in chronological order of composition.

Pliny, *N. H.*, VIII, 154:

Neminem hic (Bucephalus) alium quam Alexandrum regio instratu ornatus recepit in sedem, alias passim recipiens. (155) Nec Caesaris dictatoris quemquam alium recepisse dorso equus traditur, idemque similis humanis pedes priores habuisse. hac effigie locatus ante Veneris Geneticis aedem. fecit et divus Augustus equo tumulum, de quo Germanici Caesaris carmen est.

Statius, *Silv.*, I, 85 ff.:

Cedat equus, Latiae qui contra templa Diones
Caesarei stat sede fori; quem traderis ausus
Pellaeo, Lysippe, duci, mox Caesaris ora
Mirata cervice tulit.

Suet. *Jul.*, 61:

Utebatur autem equo insigni, pedibus prope humanis et in modum digitorum unguis fisis, quem natum apud se, cum haruspices imperium orbis terrae significare domino pronuntiassent, magna cura aluit nec patientem sessoris alterius primus ascendit; cuius etiam instar pro aede Veneris Geneticis postea dedicavit.

Dio Cassius, 37, 54 (of the events of the year 694/60):

πρὸς γὰρ τοὺς εἰρημένους¹³ ἐφ' οὓς μέγα ἀεί ποτε ἐφρόνει, ἵππος τις αὐτοῦ διαφυάς ἐν τοῖς τῶν προσθίων ποδῶν ὄπλαις ἔχων ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ἐκεῖνον μὲν γαυρούμενος ἐφερεν, ἄλλον δὲ ἀναβάτην οὐδένα ἀνεδέχετο ὥστε καὶ ἐκ τούτου μικρὸν οὐδὲν προσδοκῶν . . . τὰ νικητήρια ἀφῆκεν.

Solinus, 45, 8 ff.:

Alexandri Magni equus Bucephalus . . . cum ab equario suo alias etiam molliter sederetur accepto regio stratu

¹³ Cf. *ibid.* 37, 52, and Suet. *Jul.* 7.

neminem umquam alium praeter dominum vehere dignatus est.

(1) equus C. Caesaris nullum praeter Caesarem dorso recepit; cuius primores pedes facie vestigii humani tradunt fuisse, sicut ante Veneris Genetricis aedem hac effigie locatus est.

Georg. Cedrenus, I, p. 300 ed. Bonn:

τούτῳ (sc. Καίσαρι) ἐτέχθη ἵππος ἀντὶ ὄπλῆς χηλὰς ἔχων καὶ μηδένα ἔτερον ἀναβάτην δεχόμενος ἢ αὐτόν, ὡς Βουκέφαλος τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον.

Constantius Manasses, 1785 ff. (de Caesaris equo):

μόνον δ' αὐτὸν ἐδέχετο Γάϊον ἀναβάτην
καθάπερ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἵππος ὁ Βουκεφάλας.

The fact that there is no contemporary mention of Caesar's horse, that no name for him has come down to us, and that he is described as having his front feet cloven (?) and resembling human feet (Suetonius going even so far as to compare the divisions to human toes and leaving the impression that even his hind feet were of this sort) might tempt one to regard him, as indeed Deonna¹⁴ seems to do, as a purely mythical being and a fiction of the imagination working perhaps to make Caesar like Alexander and to give him a horse corresponding to Bucephalus.

However, the specific statement of Dio that Caesar's horse was foaled in 60 B. C., and of Pliny that Augustus built a mound for him, and that concerning him Germanicus wrote a poem (now unfortunately lost), and that his likeness was placed in front of the temple of Venus Genetrix (Suetonius stating that Caesar himself afterward dedicated it there)—these considera-

¹⁴ Deonna, *Rev. d. Et. Gr.* XXXI, 1918, p. 78: "Pour mater l'animal, Alexandre tourne sa tête au soleil, afin d'éviter que son ombre ne l'effarouche; puis, laissant tomber son manteau, il s'élance sur lui. Philippe, transporté de joie s'écrie; 'Mon fils, cherche un autre royaume, qui soit plus digne de toi, car la Macédoine est trop petite. Que signifierait cette exclamation, si ce n'est qu'en parvenant seul à dompter le cheval, attribut du dieu céleste, Alexandre s'est révélé comme un futur dieu, comme un futur maître du monde? César possède un cheval monstrueux qui a des pieds humains; les devins, expliquant ce prodige, lui annoncent qu'il sera le maître du monde. Pourquoi? C'est que ce cheval, qui n'a jamais existé en réalité, on le conçoit aisément, est un être mythique fusionnant deux formes connues du soleil, le cheval et le pied humain, tout comme l'hippalectryon unit en un ensemble bizarre le coq et le cheval de même sens."

tions seem to prove that he had an actual existence before taking on mythical characteristics.

Even the divisions, *διαφναῖ*, in the front feet are not necessarily entirely mythical. Not that these are to be thought of as cloven as in the bovine species, for the comparison to the human foot would disprove that. Rather may the feet have been a reversion to an earlier type with three separate divisions, which the mythical imagination likened to human feet with divisions into toes.

It is to be conceded that every conqueror should have a distinguished horse, one that would allow him only to mount him. As to the other elements common to the legends of the two horses it is for us to consider whether it was Caesar's *Anonymus* that influenced the legend of Alexander's *Bucephalus* or the reverse, and our answer to this question must depend to a great extent on the date of composition of the *Historia Alexandri Magni* and on the elements that entered into its makeup. If we accept with Noeldeke the view that the Romance was not a saga in the usual sense of the word, but that its elements were compiled to a great extent from literary sources, as in the main we must, and if we adhere rigorously to Kroll's view that the date of its composition did not antedate the third century of our era, it would be chronologically possible that the writer of the Romance when he wrote I, 15 and I, 17 quoted pp. 17 f. had before him Suetonius, *Jul.* 61. On the other hand Ausfeld puts the composition of the Romance shortly after 200 B. C., or four centuries before the date favored by Kroll. Even if Kroll's date be accepted, the materials out of which the Romance was made had most of them been in existence for centuries. Perhaps after all therefore a sounder way of approaching the solution of the question of relationship of Suet. *Jul.* 61 and *Hist. Alex. Magni*, I, 15 and I, 17 is to make the date of the composition of Suet. *Jul.* 61 the terminus ante for the time when the elements out of which *Hist. Alex. Mag.*, I, 15 and I, 17 came into being. In the latter work every step in the development of the legend of *Bucephalus* is a natural unfolding, and the result is a concrete organic whole, the words of Philip at the end of Plut. *Alex.* 6 showing an early step in the development of the legend of world empire for the one who could ride *Bucephalus*, *Ὥ παῖ, φάναι, ξῆται σεαντῷ βασιλείαν ἵσην· Μακεδονίᾳ γάρ σε οὐ χωρεῖ*. As

an approach to the passage in Suetonius there should be considered Statius, *Silv.*, I, 85 ff.:

Cedat equus, Latiae qui contra templa Diones
 Caesarei stat sede fori; quem traderis ausus
 Pellaeo, Lysippe, duci, mox Caesaris ora
 Mirata cervice tulit.

The interpretation of this passage given by Roscher¹⁵ and accepted by Vollmer in his edition *ad loc.* is that according to tradition the equestrian statue of Caesar standing in front of the temple of Venus Genetrix was originally one of Alexander by Lysippus ostensibly on Bucephalus, though the latter's name is not given. This implies that the front feet of the horse had been altered and that Caesar's head had been substituted for that of Alexander to the horse's great astonishment. For the understanding of the passages just cited from Pliny, Plutarch, Statius and Suetonius none of these scholars have cited the *Hist. Alex. Magni*, I, 13, 15 and 17—passages of decisive importance that make it all but certain that when Bucephalus received his new rider, Caesar, he transferred certain features of his legend to him.¹⁶

ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON.

DUKE UNIVERSITY.

¹⁵ W. H. Roscher (Jun.), "Ueber die Reiterstatue Iul. Caesars auf dem Forum Iulium und den ιππος βροτόνος einer Münze des Gordianus Pius von Nikaia (Bithynien)," in the *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*. Phil.-Hist. Classe, XLIII (1891), pp. 96 ff. I agree with both scholars (Roscher and Vollmer) in rejecting the view of Jordan, *Topogr. d. St. Rom*, I, 2, p. 439, and of Gilbert, *Gesch. u. Topogr. d. St. Rom*, III, p. 226, that the statue standing in front of the temple of Venus Genetrix and referred to by Suetonius was that of a horse without a rider. Roscher, *op. cit.*, 100, note 6, has an important note on parallels between Alexander and Caesar. In an article, "Heracles and his Successors," *Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.* XXXIX (1928), 40 f. I have treated this topic somewhat more fully.

The alteration of Greek paintings and statues to make them represent Romans was by no means an infrequent practice, cf. Plin., *N. H.* XXXV, 94.

¹⁶ Professor Francis P. Magoun, Jr., *The Gests of Alexander of Macedonia*, p. 233 n. to line 1160 has promised a study of the Bucephalus legend in the taming of Ebroun's horse in the Middle English *William of Palerne*, 3279 ff. and of Dulcifal in the Icelandic Gongu Hrolfs Saga.

WHEN DID ALEXANDER REACH THE HINDU KUSH?

[In order to avoid, among other things, difficulties in Arrian and Strabo, Plutarch's statement of a four months' halt by Alexander in Persis should be cut to seven weeks, so that Alexander may spend the winter of 330-29 at the Hindu Kush, and the next two winters at Zariaspa and Nautaca respectively.]

There are many problems, of course, connected with the campaigns of Alexander in Asia, but to a large degree they concern solely the sources. One might expect several perplexing chronological difficulties in an expedition so long and so varied, but happily this is not the case.

The only serious problem of chronology from the crossing of the Hellespont to Alexander's death at Babylon in 323 concerns the winters 330-29 and 329-28. It seems to be clear from Arrian¹ and Strabo² that the winter of 330-29 was spent on the south side of the Hindu Kush (i. e. before the first crossing). But the meaning of the Greek, we are told, is not absolutely certain and can therefore be challenged; furthermore, if the statements of Arrian and Strabo are accepted, the almost insuperable difficulty at once arises of explaining how Alexander traversed the 1300 miles from the Caspian to the Hindu Kush in the few months before winter set in. It is unfortunate that the language Arrian uses³ to describe the winter quarters of the following year (329-28) is not more explicit. The apparent meaning is that Alexander took winter quarters at Zariaspa, yet it has been maintained that Arrian is referring⁴ to the first part of a winter which was spent chiefly at Nautaca (328-27); in which case the previous winter (and not that of 330-29) must have been spent at the south foot of the Hindu Kush and it then becomes necessary to invent some place for the winter quarters of 330-29. That briefly is the problem, but before we proceed to examine it more closely, it will be well to put down a few of the almost certain dates in Alexander's life:

Born	356
Succeeds Philip.....	336
Victorious at Gaugamela.....	331
Takes up winter quarters in Persis.....	331-30

¹ III, 28, 1 f.

² Pp. 724-5.

³ IV, 7, 1.

⁴ IV, 18, 2.

Takes up winter quarters at Nautaca.....	328-27
Recrosses the Hindu Kush.....	327
Crosses the Indus.....	326
Reaches the Indian Ocean.....	325
Returns to Ecbatana.....	324
Dies at Babylon.....	323

It will be seen from the table that there is no difficulty up to Alexander's arrival in Persis and none after the recrossing of the Hindu Kush; the problem is to account for the intervening time. The evidence for this period is as follows: Alexander, setting out from Persepolis some time in 330, resumed the pursuit of Darius, whose murdered body he found near Shahrud. Then, after a delay in the region of the Caspian, he turned south into Seistan and, according to Arrian,⁵ marched in deep snow through the land of the Arachotai. This brings us fairly to the Hindu Kush. Arrian says nothing of winter quarters (although he gives the season); but we learn from him that Alexander stopped long enough at the foot of the Hindu Kush to found a city. Strabo says⁶ that Alexander passed through the land of the Paropamisadae after the setting of the Pleiades, established winter quarters below the Hindu Kush, where he built a city, and thence crossed the range into Bactria in fifteen days. We learn from Arrian⁷ that Alexander crossed before the snow was yet out of the passes.

The Hindu Kush crossed, Alexander went to Bactra, crossed the Oxus in pursuit of Bessus, and halted at Maracanda. Thence he went to the Jaxartes, where he carried on a vigorous campaign in the surrounding neighborhood. He then proceeded to Maracanda and Zariaspa. Arrian says that Alexander remained at Zariaspa "until the depth of the winter passed."⁸ He does not mention the coming of spring, but says that Alexander next recrossed the Oxus, swept the country as far as Maracanda and carried on a campaign for some time in Sogdiana, chiefly against Spitamenes. He then had his army rest at Nautaca "for what was about the depth of the winter."⁹ On the approach of spring Alexander left Nautaca and resumed operations against the "rocks," went to Bactra and in the early summer of 327 re-crossed the Hindu Kush.

From this evidence it would seem that Alexander passed

⁵ III, 28, 1 f. ⁶ *Loc. cit.* ⁷ III, 28, 9. ⁸ IV, 7, 1. ⁹ IV, 18, 2.

through the land of the Paropamisadae (roughly, the Cabul valley) in November,¹⁰ 330, spent the winter of 330-29 at the south foot of the Hindu Kush, the winter of 329-28 at Zariaspa, and that of 328-27 at Nautaca; but, as I have already said, the objection may be raised that Alexander, leaving the Caspian in October, 330, as is generally assumed, could not possibly have covered the 1300 miles to the Hindu Kush, including several stops on the way, by that winter, and therefore the disposition of the subsequent events are also in doubt. Two notable attempts have been made to get around these difficulties.

Hogarth¹¹ first focused attention on the problem by pointing out that it was physically impossible for Alexander, starting from the Caspian in October, to reach the Hindu Kush by the winter of 330-29. Hogarth therefore places Alexander in Seistan for the winter of 330-29, in Cabul (the land of the Paropamisadae) in November, 329, and at the foot of the Hindu Kush that winter. This leaves the winter of 328-27 to be accounted for, with both Zariaspa and Nautaca mentioned by Arrian as winter quarters. Hogarth maintains that but one winter is referred to, and therefore divides this winter between the two towns, further supporting his argument by the statement that, since there would be so little for Alexander to do in the summer of 328, two separate winters cannot be meant.

The latest statement of the case is by Tarn.¹² While his account of Alexander is, on the whole, excellent, on this particular point Tarn neither states the difficulties nor offers a satisfactory solution. He says that Alexander apparently never took winter quarters at all in 330-29, but in the spring of 329 Alexander had reached the Cabul valley. This meets Hogarth's objection of distance, for Tarn, too, assumes that Darius died in midsummer, 330.¹³ Accepting the obvious meaning of Arrian, Tarn assigns the winters of 329-28 and 328-27 to Zariaspa and Nautaca respectively.

The arguments against Hogarth's theory are these: There is not a shred of evidence in Arrian or elsewhere that Alexander

¹⁰ That is, just after the setting of the Pleiades. For a discussion of the precise season meant, see below.

¹¹ *Philip and Alexander of Macedon*, appendix.

¹² *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. VI, pp. 390 ff.

¹³ P. 385.

spent a winter in Seistan. Furthermore, the distance from Seistan to the Hindu Kush, where Alexander next had his winter quarters according to Hogarth, is by no means great enough to require a year to traverse. Then, too, there is more than one difficulty in assuming that only one winter was spent at Zariaspa-Nautaca. Would Alexander undertake operations against so formidable an opponent as Spitamenes in the heart of winter, and, if he did, would he then change his winter quarters? The question, however, is easily decided by the Greek, for the meaning is clear. After campaigning in Bactria and Sogdiana, Alexander went to Zariaspa, where he remained "until the depth of the winter passed."¹⁴ Then followed an expedition against Spitamenes, after which Alexander had his army rest at Nautaca "for what was about the depth of the winter."¹⁵ Certainly two distinct winters are here referred to. Hogarth, then, in not reading Arrian correctly, has failed to offer a satisfactory solution of the problem.

Hogarth's argument that there was not much for Alexander to do in 328, if we allow a winter each at Zariaspa and Nautaca, is not a strong one. Arrian's account, as a matter of fact, is quite long enough, for we must bear in mind that Alexander was dealing with a national revolt of serious proportions in eastern Iran, not so easily crushed as the sporadic outbreaks elsewhere in Asia.¹⁶ Indeed, Alexander had this summer to contend with the best opponent he had yet met. Leaving Zariaspa, he crossed the Oxus and proceeded to Maracanda. Here he divided his forces, and, by building fortified posts, tried to subdue Spitamenes not only by direct encounter, but by leaving him no place in Sogdiana where he might stay. Hogarth, however, has made an important contribution to the subject by pointing out that it is at least 1300 miles from Zadracarta, on the Caspian, to the Hindu Kush, and that Alexander, leaving Zadracarta in Octo-

¹⁴ Arrian, IV, 7, 1. ἔστε παρελθεῖν τὸ ἀκμαῖον τοῦ χειμῶνος. Hogarth, p. 303, says that "full winter-time" (used also in reference to Nautaca, see below) may be applied equally to December or to February, and therefore to two winter quarters; but the word to stress here, rather, is παρελθεῖν, which means *passed*.

¹⁵ Ib., IV, 18, 2. ὅ τι πέρ ἀκμαῖον τοῦ χειμῶνος.

¹⁶ Furthermore, Curtius' account (VII, 10, 13 f.) is longer than Arrian's and implies a full year's campaign.

ber, could not possibly have reached the Hindu Kush, as had been previously believed, by December.

Tarn's theory is harder to attack, since it is not so detailed as Hogarth's. Tarn does not represent Alexander as being in any particular place in the winter of 330-29, but he does say that in the spring of 329 Alexander was already in the Cabul valley. In this case, he goes against the evidence of Arrian that Alexander traversed all this district in snow, and against the evidence of Strabo that Alexander passed through the land of the Paropamisadae after the setting of the Pleiades (November) and established winter quarters at the foot of the Hindu Kush. It may be objected that the snow in Arrian was due to a late winter, but why does not Arrian mention this and why does he omit all reference to the real snows of winter? Arrian, to be sure, does not mention winter quarters, but the halt at the foot of the Hindu Kush to found a city probably represents accurately enough the main stop of the winter. This is the obvious meaning of Arrian and it is substantiated by the important passage in Strabo. Strabo specifically says that Alexander passed through the land of the Paropamisadae (the Cabul valley) after the setting of the Pleiades (*ἐπό πλειάδος δύσιν*). The Pleiades, of course, set every day, but it was the custom of the ancients to refer only to the morning and evening setting of stars. In antiquity the apparent evening setting of the Pleiades occurred in April, the morning one about the middle of November. Strabo does not state which setting he has in mind, but it was the general practice of ancient writers (particularly the later ones) to mean the morning setting, and this is obviously Strabo's meaning, for a few lines later he speaks of winter quarters at the Hindu Kush and of Alexander founding a city there. It is manifest that Tarn, in bringing Alexander here some months later, after the conclusion of winter, has failed to solve our difficulty.

The solution I offer is this: I agree with Hogarth that the obvious meaning of Arrian and Strabo is that Alexander was in the Cabul valley in November and took up winter quarters at the south foot of the Hindu Kush; and with Tarn, that Arrian's later account simply means that Alexander spent one winter at Zariaspa and the next at Nautaca. In other words, I do not agree with Hogarth that Alexander spent a winter in Seistan,

before the one at the Hindu Kush, and divided a winter between Zariaspa and Nautaca; nor with Tarn, that Alexander did not reach the Hindu Kush until spring of 329. But in this latter case I lay myself open to the very serious objection raised by Hogarth that Alexander leaving Zadracarta in October could hardly reach the Hindu Kush that winter. The question then is, *Did Alexander leave Zadracarta in October?* This view is generally accepted, for chronologists have agreed that Darius died in midsummer, and several weeks must elapse between his death and Alexander's departure from Zadracarta. But acceptance of this will forever leave the winters of 330-29 and 329-28 in doubt. The evidence that Alexander spent the winter of 330-29 at the Hindu Kush and that of 329-28 at Zariaspa rests on such good authority that we must make sure that the evidence for Darius' death in midsummer of 330 is unimpeachable.

Hogarth gives a convenient table.¹⁷ After the battle of Gau-gamela, dated to October 1st, 331, by a lunar eclipse eleven days previously, we must allow for—

March to Babylon.....	at least 40 days	
Halt in Babylon.....	34 "	{ (Curt., V, 1, 39; Just., XI, 14)
March to Susa.....	20 "	(Arr., III, 16, 7)
Stay in Susa.....	x "	
March to Persepolis.....	30 "	
Stay in Persis.....	120 "	(Plut., <i>Alex.</i> 37, 3)
March to Ecbatana.....	12 + x "	(Arr., III, 19, 3)
Stay in Ecbatana.....	x "	
March to Rhagae.....	11 "	(Arr., III, 20, 2)
Stay in Rhagae.....	5 "	(Arr., III, 20, 3)
Last stages of the pursuit..	5 "	(Arr., III, 21)
<hr/>		
Total.....	277 + x days.	

"The death of Darius, therefore," concludes Hogarth, "took place near Shahrud, about the three hundredth day after Arbela, i. e. at the very end of July or beginning of August, 330. This, as it happens, coincides, according to received computation, with Arrian's statement (III, 22) that the month of the murder was the Attic *Hecatombaeon*." But, two pages previously, Hogarth warns against accepting the month-dates of Arrian, and I should urge a like reserve here.

¹⁷ P. 289.

Certainly the marching time allowed in the above table must be accepted. In fact, the only point that can possibly be questioned is Plutarch's statement that Alexander remained in Persis four months. We have no way of knowing on what authority Plutarch based this statement; we only know that everything else he says about Alexander's stay in Persis, as well as his approach to the country, is worthless anecdote; whereas we do know that Arrian generally drew on very good material, usually Ptolemy and Aristobulus. The whole argument comes down, then, to whether we ought to believe Arrian (incidentally, supported by Strabo) or Plutarch. We must choose between them, for they cannot be reconciled. If we accept the four months of Plutarch, then Darius' death must have occurred in midsummer, 330, in which case we are unable to accept Arrian's statements that Alexander reached the Hindu Kush that winter and spent a winter each at Zariaspa and Nautaca. We are forced either, on the one hand, to interpose a winter between Zadracarta and the Hindu Kush, and to allow but one winter for Zariaspa-Nautaca; or, on the other hand, if we give a winter each to Zariaspa and Nautaca, we must postpone Alexander's arrival at the Hindu Kush until spring of 329. But, if we assume that Plutarch exaggerated the length of Alexander's stay in Persis, then Darius' death will fall early enough in 330 to allow Alexander time to reach the Hindu Kush that winter and to spend the next two winters at Zariaspa and Nautaca respectively.

According to Hogarth's figures, Alexander reached Persepolis $124 + x$ days after Gaugamela, or about February 5th. Does it seem reasonable that Alexander would delay in Persis four months and not set out against Darius until about June 1st? This hardly seems consistent with Alexander, the man of action. Of course Alexander remained some weeks in Persis, for he had reached the heart of the Persian empire and undoubtedly wished to take stock, and perhaps to undertake a short winter campaign against the neighboring tribes.¹⁸ Let us, then, shorten his stay in Persis from four months to seven weeks, and see what the result will be.

The march from Persepolis to the place of Darius' death,

¹⁸ Curt., V, 6, 17-20. Arr., Ind. 40, 7.

according to the table, occupied $33 + x$ days, or, to make a generous allowance, about 40 days. Alexander, then, leaving Persepolis about March 25th, found Darius' body about May 3rd. He then crossed the Elburz mountains to Zadracarta in Hyrcania, overran Tapuria, reduced the Mardi and returned to Zadracarta, where he remained fifteen days. In view of the distance to be covered and the halt at Zadracarta we should allow six weeks to elapse between the finding of Darius' body and the departure from Zadracarta. This brings us to June 13th.

Hogarth gives the stages by the great caravan route from Zadracarta (near Sari, on the Caspian littoral) to the Hindu Kush in round numbers as follows:¹⁹

Sari to Shahrud.....	at least 100 miles
Shahrud to Meshed.....	over 300 "
Meshed to Herat.....	about 220 "
Herat to Candahar by the great road.....	about 330 "
Candahar to the Hindu Kush north of Cabul...	about 350 "
<hr/>	
	1300 miles

In addition to the actual marching time, about 75 days should be allowed for the Treason Trials, the halt among the Euergetae and the founding of colonies in the region of Candahar.

The time allotted by Hogarth²⁰ for this stretch, 14 or 15 months, is certainly too great. Half that would be nearer the truth, for it is not too much to assume that Alexander could average 12 miles a day for four months with 75 days of rest added, particularly when we remember that he was anxious to catch Bessus before Bessus had time to cause a serious revolt. The following table, I think, fairly represents the facts:

Alexander leaves Zadracarta (east of Sari).....	June 13
March to Shahrud (8 days).....	June 20
Shahrud to Meshed (24 days).....	July 14
Meshed to Herat (17 days).....	July 31
Herat to Candahar by the great road:	
Marching time.....	25 days
Halts	75 days
<hr/>	
100 days.....	November 8

Candahar to the Hindu Kush north of Cabul (35 days) December 13

This schedule demands of Alexander less than 13 miles a day

¹⁹ P. 296.

²⁰ P. 300.

for the 74 days from Zadracarta to Candahar, with 75 days of rest added. The march from Candahar to Cabul was more difficult, and therefore an average of 10 miles a day is assigned to this section. Surely the schedule is conservative, for it was a time when speed undoubtedly was called for.

In order to obtain this schedule, I have been forced to disregard a passage in Plutarch, but as a result we find no difficulty in Arrian. The death of Darius is placed early enough in the year to enable Alexander to proceed according to Arrian. Arrian tells us, it will be recalled, that Alexander passed through the country of the Arachotai in deep snow. The Arachotai inhabited the district between Candahar and Cabul, much of it mountainous, and, since Alexander did not leave Candahar until about November 9th, the mountain passes would be blocked with snow at this time. Although he does not mention winter quarters, Arrian does speak of a halt at the foot of the Hindu Kush to found a city. Alexander reached this point about the middle of December; obviously, he could not cross the great range until early spring and the only inference to be drawn is that Alexander spent this winter at his new city. This is confirmed by Strabo, who says that Alexander passed through the land of the Paropamisadae (roughly, the Cabul valley) after the setting of the Pleiades. Alexander left Candahar before the setting of the Pleiades (middle of November) and reached the Hindu Kush within less than a month of their setting. Since the land of the Paropamisadae stretched south and west from the Hindu Kush, Alexander arrived sufficiently soon after the setting of the Pleiades so that the designation of the season might be used accurately enough. Finally, Strabo expressly states that Alexander built a city and took up winter quarters at the Hindu Kush. The next spring, while there was yet snow in the passes according to Arrian, Alexander crossed the range. Furthermore, these conclusions permit us to accept Arrian's statement that Alexander spent a winter at Zariaspa and one at Nautaca.

On the other hand, if we accept Plutarch's statement that Alexander remained four months in Persis, then the death of Darius, as I have already said, must fall in midsummer of 330, in which case Alexander could not have reached the Hindu Kush before the winter was over. This necessitates one of two things:

either we must assume, with Hogarth, that Alexander spent the winter of 330-29 somewhere in Seistan (on no evidence whatever), reached the Hindu Kush the following winter, and, contrary to Arrian, divided the winter of 328-27 between Zariaspa and Nautaca; or, with Tarn, we must, on account of the distance, postpone Alexander's arrival at the Hindu Kush until spring, 329, which is contrary to the meaning of Arrian and Strabo, although it permits us, correctly, to assign a winter each to Zariaspa and Nautaca.

I have little hesitation, then, in saying that Plutarch must bow to Arrian; that his statement of a four months' halt by Alexander in Persis should be cut to seven weeks, so that Alexander may reach the Cabul valley in November (or early December) and take up winter quarters at the south foot of the Hindu Kush (so Arrian and Strabo). At the same time, I am able, with Arrian, to assign a winter each to Zariaspa and Nautaca.

The following table will serve to illustrate the conclusions reached in this discussion:

Alexander reaches Persis.....	early February	330
" leaves Persis.....	end of March	330
" overtakes Darius.....	early May	330
" leaves Zadracarta.....	middle of June	330
" reaches Candahar.....	early November	330
" establishes winter quarters at the south foot of the Hindu Kush.....	middle of December	330
" crosses the Hindu Kush.....	early spring	329
" takes up winter quarters at Zariaspa.....	winter	329-28
" campaigns in Sogdiana.....	summer	328
" takes up winter quarters at Nautaca.....	winter	328-27
" recrosses the Hindu Kush.....	early summer	327

C. A. ROBINSON, JR.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

THE FIGURE ΑΔΥΝΑΤΟΝ IN GREEK AND LATIN POETRY.

Doubtless throughout Greek and Latin literature but especially in poetry are to be found, now in manifold forms of positive and negative statement, now in positive and negative declarations of perpetuity, assertions and averments embodying concrete illustrations of the impossible.¹ These illustrative examples, modified in frequency of occurrence by departmental tradition and the author's emotion (real or assumed), exhibit a rhetorical phenomenon variously conceived and developed. The technical designation of the figure is *σχῆμα ἐκ (ἀπὸ) τοῦ ἀδυνάτου*.² Every *ἀδύνατον* in the sense here considered is a species of hyperbole,³ revealing an exaggeration of the truth (*veritatis superlatio atque traeiectio*) in a statement of a thing that does not exist, of a condition that is not true, of an action that does not take place, or of something that will never end or come to pass, hence an asseveration of the impossible, expressly stated or implied. It is the purpose of this paper to present succinctly by classes the various forms of these statements—nearly two hun-

¹ Limited collections of examples are found in Forbiger's *Vergil*, 1872 (n. on Ecl. I, 59); Smith, *Elegies of Tibullus*, 1913 (I, 4, 65 f.); Shorey, *Horace, Odes and Epodes*, 1910 (Epod. XVI, 25); Heim, *Incantamenta Magica*, Diss. Leipzig, 1892 (reprint from *Annal. Philol. Suppl. XIX*), pp. 491 f.; Pirrone, *Athenaeum* (Italian), II (1914), pp. 38-45; Sentieri, *ibid.* VII (1919), 179-84; Canter, *Rhetorical Elements in the Tragedies of Seneca*, Univ. of Illinois Stud. in Lang. and Lit. X, pp. 60-62. Excluded here are sundry examples connected with magic (as Propert. IV, 5, 5-12; Claud. In Rufin. I, 146-161) and containing the stock materials of the *ἀδύνατον*. In such cases the figure loses its proper force since the accomplishment of the otherwise impossible is the business of magic.

² It is singular that this term is not used by ancient grammarians and scholiasts, or by the great rhetoricians (Aristotle, Cicero, Auct. ad Herenn., Quint.), or by the minor stylists of the *Rethores Graeci* and the *Rethores Latini*. As an exception note Fortunatianus, *Rhet. Lat. Minores* (Halm 1863), 83, 24, who classifies it as constituting a species of *causarum ἀσυστάτων* (incongruous cases) and illustrates, *cum id in themate ponitur, quod sit contra rerum naturalium fidem*.

³ Cf. Demetr. Phal. *De Elocutione*, Radermacher's ed. Leipzig, 1901, p. 29, §§ 123 f., who discusses three kinds of hyperbole, expressed in terms of likeness, superiority, or impossibility. He pronounces hyperbole

dred—gathered from the principal poets ranging from earliest works to the Anthologies, to examine their content and to note sundry details of usage as to authors and departments. Ordinarily, except in Greek usage, a single *ἀδύνατον* is not employed, but a series—sometimes distastefully long—and the examples show a marked tendency toward similarity of content and stereotyped form of expression. In general it may be said that the figure *ἀδύνατον* is made up of two parts, one balanced against, and measured in terms of, the other, i. e., part one, expressing what the speaker considers, or accepts as a symbol of, the impossible is set off against part two, containing that which is by the very nature of things impossible. More specifically the several forms in which the statements appear are:

I. Things or conditions utterly impossible, or believed to be so, are true or would prove true sooner than the thing or condition mentioned by the writer could be true or capable of realization, e. g., Anth. Pal. XI, 436: *θᾶττον ἔην λευκὸς κόρακας πτηνάς τε χελώνας | εὑρεῖν, η δόκιμον βῆτορα.* Latin examples are numerous with “sooner than” variously expressed, as by antequam: Verg. Ecl. I, 59-63 ante leves ergo pascentur in aethere cervi, | et freta destituent nudos in litore pisces; | . . . quam nostro illius labatur pectore vultus; Aen. IX, 115 f.; Dirae 4-8; Sen. Phaed. 568-73; Herc. Oet. 335-38; 1582-84; Oct. 222-26; Ovid, Meta. XIII, 324-27; Stat. Achil. I, 657-60; Claud. Prob. et Olybr. 169-73; Anth. Lat. 440 entire (Riese); Licentius, Carm. ad Augustin. P L M. III, 433, 92-102 (Wernsdorf); ante . . . prius quam: Ovid, Ex Pont. II, 11, 5-8; citius quam: Sil. Ital. V, 253-55 Trasumenus in altos | adscendat citius colles, quam sanguine roret | iste pio ramus; Propert. III, 19, 5-10; Ovid, Ex Pont. II, 4, 25-29; II, 8, 65-67; Anth. Lat. 476; potius quam: Stat. Silv. V, 5, 62-64 potius fugientia ripas | flumina detineas rapidis aut ignibus obstes | quam miseris lugere vetes; priusquam: Hor. Od. I, 33, 7-9; Epod. V, 79-82; Propert.

the most frigid of all figures for the reason that it suggests something impossible. This view ignores too far the truth that while hyperbole in practical usage may lose its ornamental character its proper employment is a decens veri superiectio (Quint. VIII, 6, 67); also that its force consists in the fact that the hearer (reader) attributes the exaggeration to the speaker's (writer's) emotion and so, in some degree at least, shares it sympathetically.

I, 15, 29-31; II, 32, 49-51; Dirae 98-101; Ovid, Ibis 31-40; Meta. XIV, 37-39; Ars Amat. I, 271-73, Trist. IV, 7, 11-20; V, 13, 21-23; Ex Pont. I, 6, 51-53; IV, 5, 41-44; IV, 6, 45-50; prius . . . ante quam: Sen. Thy. 476-82; prius . . . citius quam: Propert. II, 15, 31-35. Occasionally one part of the comparative formula is represented, or made unnecessary, by an independent statement, as Eurip. Iph. Aul. 950-54 *οὐχ ἄφεται σῆς θυγατρὸς Ἀγαμέμνων . . . ἡ Σίπυλος ἔσται πόλις . . . Φθίας δὲ τοῦνομού οὐδαμοῦ κέκλησται.* Trag. inc. 86 (Ribbeck); Stat. Silv. II, 1, 8-12 intempesta cano: citius me tigris abactis | fetibus orbatique velint audire leones, etc.; or by a question, Stat. Theb. VII, 550-53 tene ille . . . Argiva in castra remittet? | Ante haec excusso frondescit lancea ferro | Inachus ante retro nos-terque Achelous abibit; Theb. XII, 155-57; Silv. V, 1, 32-36; Sen. Herc. Fur. 373-78; Claud. Bell. Gild. I. 382 f.

II. If (since, when) the thing or condition mentioned by the writer is possible (true), then that thing or condition is possible (true) which nature's laws make impossible (false); see Eurip. Suppl. 520 f., where Theseus says in refusing to yield to base compulsion by Creon, *ἄνω γὰρ ἀν ρέοι | τὰ πράγματα οὐτως, εἰ πιταξόμεσθα δῆ.* Anth. Pal. IX, 380, 1-4 *εἰ κύκνῳ δύναται κόρυδος παραπλήσιον ἔδειν, | . . . ἵστα ποεῖν καὶ ἐγὼ Παλλαδίῳ δύναμαι.* Hor. Od. III, 5, 31-34 si pugnat extricata densis | cerva plagis, erit ille fortis | qui perfidis se credidit hostibus, etc.; Propert. II, 1, 65-70 hoc si quis vitium poterit mihi demere, solus | Tantaleae poterit tradere poma manu, etc.; Juv. XIII, 64-70 egregium sanctumque virum si cerno, . . . | . . . sub aratro | piscibus inventis et fetae comparo mulae, etc.; Ovid, Ex Pont. III, 3, 95-98; Claud. In Eutrop. I, 352-57; Stat. Silv. IV, 3, 136-39; Hor. Od. I, 29, 10-16 quis neget arduis | pronos relabi posse rivos | montibus et Tiberim reverti, | cum tu, etc.? Ovid, Her. V, 29 f. cum Paris Oenone poterit spirare relicta | ad fontem Xanthi versa recurret aqua; Trist. I, 8, 1-10 omnia iam fiant (the eight *ἀδύνατα* mentioned) . . . quia sum deceptus. As a variation from the above norm there occur statements that although (if) things which nature's laws and conditions make impossible should occur still the thing or condition mentioned will or would not occur or be possible, as Sen. Herc. Oct. 467-72 descendat astris Luna desertis licet | et bruma messes videat,

etc. . . . non flectet illum; Catull. LV, 23-32; Stat. Silv. II, 2, 36-42; V, 1, 23-28; Sen. Thy. 784-88.

III. Two things or conditions are mentioned, both equally untrue (impossible) or so regarded, the two parts of the statement being joined by some form of comparison or coördination, as Hom. Il. I, 233-44 *vai μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον, τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτε φύλα καὶ ὅζους | φύσει, . . . τότε δ’ οὐ τι δυνήσει ἀχνύμενός περ | χραισμέν,* etc. This famous example, in which Achilles swears by the scepter as a symbol of power, is imitated by Verg. Aen. XII, 201-11 nulla dies pacem hanc Italis nec foedera rumpet, | . . . ut scepturn hoc . . . | numquam fronde levi fundet virgulta nec umbras, etc.; also by Val. Flac. III, 707-14 hastam | quae neque iam frondes, virides nec proferet umbras | . . . nec nos tumida haec tum dicta iuvabunt. (Other examples in imitation are Soph. Elec. 417-23; Stat. Theb. VII, 552 f.) Various forms of coördination appear, as in Theoc. XVI, 60-63 ἀλλ’ ἵσος γὰρ δὲ μόχθος ἐπ’ ἄρνι κύματα μετρεῖν | . . . ἡ ὑδατι νίζειν θολερὰν διαειδεῖ πλίνθον, | καὶ φιλοκερδείᾳ βεβλαμμένον ἄνδρα παρειπεῖν. Plaut. Pseud. 319, where Ballio the procurer says to Pseudolus the slave in regard to a money matter, *qua opera credam tibi | una opera adligem fugitivam canem agninis lactibus;* Asin. 99 f. *iubeas una opera me piscari in aere | venari autem rete iaculo in medio mari* (said of attempt to rob one who has nothing); Most. 259 *una opera ebur atramento candefacere* (of making cheeks more beautiful with rouge); Capt. 562 f. *et quidem Alcumeus atque Orestes et Lycurgus postea | una opera mihi sunt sodales qua iste;* Men. 745-49 *ego te simitu novi cum Porthaone | . . . novi cum Calcha simul: | eodem die illum vidi quo te ante hunc diem;* Hor. Epod. XVI, 25-34 *simul imis saxa renarint | vadis levata, ne redire sit nefas; | neνι conversa domum pigeat dare lintea, quando | Padus Matina laverit cacumina, etc.;* Ars Poet. 11-13 *non (damus veniam quidlibet audendi) ut placidis coeant immitia, etc.;* Verg. Ecl. X. 29 f. *nec lacrimis crudelis amor nec gramina rivis | nec cytiso saturantur apes nec fronde capellae;* Claud. in Eutrop. I, 348 f. *riderique nefas (Eutropius' consulship) veluti nigrantibus alis | corvo certante ligustris;* Plaut. Stich. 773 (servant says of a merry party) *satis esse nobis non magis potis est quam fungo imber;* Pseud. 102 f. *quod tu istis lacrumis . . . | non pluris refert quam si imbrem in cibrum geras;* Mart. X, 65, 12 f. *tam*

dispar (as Charmenion to the poet) aquilae columba non est, etc.; Juv. VII, 201 f. (the fortunate man) corvo quoque rario albo; Ovid, Ex Pont. IV, 14, 13 f. (Ovid of his land of banishment) gramina cultus ager, frigus minus odit hirundo, etc.; Stat. Theb. XI, 435-38 (of attempts to check the wrath of the warring princes) non verba magis suadentia frangunt | accensos . . . quam | Pontus Cyaneos vetuit concurrere montes.

IV. Two things or conditions are mentioned, the impossibility of one of which is revealed only by inference, association, or juxtaposition of statement, not by formal comparison or coördination, as Eurip. Med. 410 (Jason having proved faithless the chorus exclaims that the impossible has happened) ἄνω ποταμῶν ἵερῶν χωροῦσι παγαί. This more subtle expression of the ἀδύνατον is fairly frequent, and a somewhat fuller illustration is desirable; Archil. 71, 6 f. (Hiller) (Zeus has sent night at midday) μηδεὶς ἔθ' ὑμέων εἰσορῶν θαυμαζέτω | μηδ' ὅταν δελφῖσι θῆρες ἀνταμείψωνται νομόν, etc.; Theoc. I, 132-36 (the cruel Love-Goddess has done to death Daphnis, the friend of wild things) νῦν ἴα μὲν φορέοιτε βάτοι, φορέοιτε δ' ἄκανθαι; Soph. Elect. 420-23 (Agamemnon's return to power, deemed impossible, is foretokened) ἐκ τε τοῦδ' ἄνω βλαστεῖν βρύοντα θαλλόν, etc.; Anth. Pal. V, 19, 5 f. (Rufinus prefers rouge to fair complexions) βοσκήσει δελφῖνας ὁ δειδροκόμης Ἐρύμανθος, etc. Hor. Ars Poet. 29 f. (giving variety not allowed by a simple subject of art) delphinum silvis appingit, fluctibus aprum; Verg. Ecl. III, 90 f. (success in poetry deserved by admirers of poor writers) atque idem iungat vulpes et mulgeat hircos; VIII, 26-28 Mopso Nysa datur . . . iungentur iam grypes equis, etc.; Tibull. I, 9, 35 f. (of one whose disloyalty, despite words to the contrary, cannot be hidden) illis eriperet verbis mihi sidera caeli | lucere et pronas fluminis esse vias; Propert. III, 3, 5-7 (vain effort to renounce love poetry for sterner studies) quaerebam, sicca si posset piscis harena | nec solitus ponto vivere torvus aper; Val. Flac. III, 705 f. (Meleager and Calais brave leaders?) aspera nunc pavidos contra ruit agna leones; Mart. X, 100, 3 f. (a stupid poetaster would mix verses with those of Martial) quid congregare cum leonibus volpes aquilisque similes facere noctuas quaeris? Ovid, Trist. V, 4, 7-12 (does one ask the cause of Ovid's sorrow?) ostendi solem postulat ille sibi, | nec frondem in silvis, nec aperto mollia prato | gramina, nec pleno flumine cernit aquam; V, 12, 7 f.

(Ovid be cheerful?) *exigis ut Priamus natorum funere plaudat, | et Niobe festos ducat ut orba choros;* Sen. Herc. Oet. 280-82 (*Iole a slave become daughter-in-law of Jove?*) *non flamma cursus pariter et torrens feret, etc.;* Phoen. 82-89 (*a dutiful child sprung from Oedipus?*) *regeret in fontem citas | revolutus undas amnis, etc.;* Claud. Carm. XL, 13-16 (*Olybrius forget Claudian?*) *lucem iam condet Hydaspes, etc.;* Anth. Lat. 729 *responsum puellae (to a proposed union) nec miser eximiae cervae iungatur asellus, etc.;* ibid. 390, a rustic slave would wed Eucheria, then monstrous unions of all kinds are fitting (twenty-eight *ἀδύνατα* in sixteen distichs). In comedy the *ἀδύνατον* is freely used in proverb; see Aristoph. Lys. 158 (of vain effort) *κύνα δέρειν δεδαρμένην.* Pax 1083 *οὕποτε ποίησεις τὸν καρκίνον ὄρθα βαδίζειν.* Plaut. Persa 41 *aquam a pumice nunc postulas;* Pseud. 75 *pumiceos oculos habeo;* Poen. 344 *quo die Orcus Accherunte mortuos amiserit;* Most. 791 *simul flare et sorbere;* Men. 247 *in scirpo nodum quaeris (so Ter. Andr. 941);* Asin. 92 f. *nudo detrahere vestimenta . . . sine pennis volare;* Men. 917 f. *purpureum panem esse . . . avis squamossas, piscis pennatos;* Pseud. 369 *in pertusum ingerimus dicta dolium;* Poen. 775 *lupo agnum eripere;* Ter. Phorm. 186 *laterem lavare.*

V. A thing or condition is declared to be impossible or untrue in terms of an impossible count or estimate. Examples are numerous, and the two parts of the statement are variously correlated, as Hom. Il. II, 467-72 *μυρίοι ὄσσα τε φύλλα καὶ ἄγθεα γίνεται ὥρη, | τόσσοι, etc.;* Pind. Olym. II, 98-100 *ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφεγεν | καὶ κεῖνος ὄσα χάρματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν | τίς ἀν φράσαι δύνατο;* | Theoc. XXX, 26-28 *ὅτις δοκίμοι τὸν δολομάχανον νικάσῃ *Ἐρον, οὗτος δοκίμοι τοῖς ὑπὲρ ἀμμέων | εὑρην βραῦδίως ἄστερας, ὅππόσσακιν ἔννεα.* Verg. Georg. II, 104-108 *neque enim numero comprehendere refert; | . . . Lybici velit aequoris idem | discere quam multae Zephyro turbentur harenæ, | . . . nosse quot Ionii veniant ad litora fluctus; Anacreontea 13 (Hiller) *εἰ φύλλα πάντα δένδρων ἐπίστασαι κατειπεῖν, | . . . σε τῶν ἐμῶν ἐρώτων μόνον ποῶ λογιστήν.* Sen. Oed. 600-07 *non tot caducas educat frondes Eryx | nec tot . . . non tot . . . nec tanta | quot ille populos vatis eduxit sonus; Lucan VII, 755-57 quidquid fodit Hiber, quidquid Tagus expuit auri, | quod legit dives summis Arimaspus harenis, | ut rapiant, parvo scelus hoc venisse putabant; Ovid,**

Her. XVII, 107 f. non magis illius numerari gaudia noctis, | Hellestiaci quam maris alga potest; Trist. IV. 1, 57-59 vere prius flores aestu numerabis aristas, | poma per autumnum frigoribusque nives, | quam mala, quae toto patior iactatus in orbe. Occasionally one part of the statement is not formally correlated, as in Stat. Silv. I, 4, 127-30 qua nunc tibi pauper acerra | digna litem? nec si vacuet Mevania valles, etc. | sufficiam; III, 95-98 uni parent commissa ministro, | . . . hibernos citius numeraveris imbræ, etc. Juv. X, 219-26 (a parody on such passages as Verg. Georg. II, 104-08, Ovid, Trist. IV, 1, 55-59; Ex Pont. II, 7, 25-30) names as ἀδύνατα the numbering of Oppia's lovers, a doctor's dead patients, partners defrauded, wards dishonored, villas owned by a barber, etc. Other examples conforming in general to the patterns given are: Hom. Il. II, 800 f.; VIII, 558-61; IX, 385; Od. IX, 51 f.; Pind. Pyth. IX, 45-49; Olym. XII 46; Anon. Poet (apud Plut. Adv. Stoic. XIX Dübner); Apoll. Rhod. IV, 214-17; Anth. Pal. XII, 145, 2-4; XII, 195, 1-4; Catull. VII, 3-10 (imitated by Mart. VI, 34, 2-6); XLVIII, 4-6; LXI, 202-06; Verg. Georg. II, 42-44; Aen. VI, 309-11; 625 f.; Ovid, Meta. XI, 614 f.; Ibis 197-200; Ars Amat. I, 57-59; 253 f.; II, 517-20; III, 149-51; 185-187; Trist. I, 5, 47 f.; IV, 1, 55-59; IV, 10, 107 f.; V, 1, 31-33; V, 2, 23-28; V, 6, 37-44; Ex Pont. II, 7, 25-30; IV, 15, 7-10; Sil. Ital. IV, 525-28; Stat. Silv. IV, 3, 148-52; V, 1, 57-63; V, 1, 101-07; Claud. in Eutrop. I, 32-36.

VI. Assertions of the impossible, now in negative now in positive form, through averments and illustrations of perpetuity. For negative statements see Soph. Philoc. 1329-35 καὶ παῦλαν ἵσθι τῆσδε μή ποτ' ἀν τυχεῖν | νόσου βαρείας, ἔως ἀν αὐτὸς ἥλιος | ταύτη μὲν αἴρῃ τῆδε δ' αὖ δύνη, etc.; Aristoph. Pax 1075 f. (and 1112) οὐ γάρ πω τοῦτ' ἐστὶ . . . φυλόπιδος λῆξαι, πρίν κεν λύκος οὖν ὑμεναιοῖ. Anth. Pal. VII, 7 f. γνώσεαι ὡς Ἀΐδεω σκότον ἔκφυγον· οὐδέ τις ἔσται | τῆς λυρικῆς Σαπφοῦς νόνυμος ἥλιος. Verg. Aen. IX, 446-49 nulla dies umquam memori vos [Nisum et Euryalum] aevo, | dum domus Aeneae Capitolii immobile saxum | accolet, etc.; Sil. Ital. XVII, 606-10 non ullo Cannas abolebis, Jupiter, aevo; | decessesque prius regnis, quam nomina gentes | aut facta Hannibilis sileant; Sen. Med. 401-07 dum terra caelum media libratum feret | . . . numquam meus cessabit in poenas furor | crescatque

semper. Other instances occur: Callim. frag. 209; Crit. Eleg. 7, 5-10; Anth. Pal. VII, 716, 5; Sil. Ital. VII, 476-78; VIII, 173-75; Stat. Silv. III, 1, 180 f.; Theb. V, 748-50. Statements in positive form are more frequent, as Anth. Pal. VII, 153, 2-4
ἔστ' ἀν οὐδωρ τε νάγη, καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλη | αὐτοῦ τῆδε μένουσα . . . | ἀγγελέω παριοῦσι, etc.; Hor. Epod. XV, 7-10 dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion | . . . fore hunc amorem mutuum; Verg. Ecl. V, 76-78 dum iuga montis aper, fluvios dum piscis amabit, | dumque thymo pascentur apes, dum rore cicadae, | semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt; Lucan I, 89-93 dum terra fretum terramque levabit | aer et longi volvent Titana labores | noxque diem caelo totidem per signa sequetur, | nulla fides regni sociis, etc.; Stat. Silv. IV, 3, 160-63 donec Troicus ignis et renatae | Tarpeius pater intonabit aulae, etc.; Claud. In Rufin. II, 526 f. praeceps ibi mersus anhelet, | dum rotat astra polus, feriunt dum litora venti: Bello. Goth. 54-60 tum demum ferrea sumet | ius in te [Romam] Lachesis, cum sic mutaverit axem | foederibus natura novis, ut flumine verso, etc. Other examples in positive form: Hom. et Hes. Certamen 255-259 (Rzach); Anth. Pal. IX, 821, 2; Hor. Od. III, 30, 7-9; Verg. Aen. I, 607-10; Tibull. I, 4, 65 f.; Ovid, Amor. I, 15, 9-32; Trist. III, 71, 51 f.; Lucan IX, 984-86; Sil. Ital. VI, 546-49; Sen. Oed. 504-08; Herc. Oet. 1576-79; Stat. Silv. I, 1, 93 f.; I, 6, 100-03.

In content by far the greater number of the *ἀδύνατα* express reversals of nature, as in animals (habitat, mode of life, disposition, physical form, strange associations and monstrous matings); in mankind (abode, customs, typical qualities); in plants and flowers (place found, blossom and fruitage); in countries (products, climate, seasons, winds, temperature); in the physical universe (earth, ocean, tides, the elements, heavenly bodies, night and day). The reversal of rivers is a commonplace (stayings and turnings in course, twenty examples). In the "impossible count" type the measure is taken from the number of the stars, sands and pebbles of the shore, waves of the sea, flowers of spring, birds of the air and sea, fish of the deep, blades of grass, ears of grain, riches of the lands of fabled wealth, etc. Perpetuity is expressed in terms of the movement of the heavenly bodies, the downward course of streams, the breaking of waves upon the shore, the growth of trees and their fruitage, the

natural habitat and dispositions of animals, etc. A favorite theme is the *immortality* of poesy, of which the most elaborate instance is Ovid, Amor. I, 15, 9-32; other examples are: Anth. Pal. VII, 17, 7 f.; VII, 716, 5 f.; Hor. Od. III, 30, 7.; Verg. Aen. IX, 446-49; Tibull. I, 4, 65 f.; Ovid, Trist. III, 7, 51 f.; Lucan IX, 984-86.

It is apparent, without making exact relative computations, that the figure is used much less frequently in Greek poetry than in Latin,⁴ a result due to the greater rhetorical restraint of the former. As to departments and individual authors, it appears most often, as we should expect, in the shorter, personal forms of poetry—lyric, elegy, epigram.⁵ Greek epic shows relatively few instances, nearly all of the “impossible count” type. In Latin epic several types are found and the use is extended, least frequently in Vergil and Valerius Flaccus, most so in Silius Italicus and Claudian. In Greek tragedy the use is limited, in Latin (Seneca) it is much freer. Examples from comedy tend strongly toward the proverb (Plautus, 14 times, Terence, 2). The pastoral is fairly well represented, but didactic poetry (no example in Lucretius) and satire (none in Horace or Persius) scarcely at all. In all authors examined, Greek and Latin, the master of rhetoric Ovid has the greatest number of examples (37), few in the narrative elegy (*Meta.*), many in the erotic elegy, very many in the poems written during banishment. Its increase in the later period is doubtless due in part to the poet's unhappy lot, which denied him more fruitful themes, and

⁴ This is evident not only from the number of occurrences, but also from the total number of *dōvvara* within the individual series; (cf. Professor Shorey on Hor. Epop. XVI, 25, referring to the celebrated oath of the self-exiled folk of Phocaea (Herod. I, 165), “one *dōvvarov* sufficed the Phocaeans. They sunk a mass of iron, and swore not to return till it came to the surface. The rhetorical Roman elaborates the conceit”). Examples considered in this paper show that of the 36 instances in Greek, one *dōvvarov* occurs 20 times; two, 11; three, 3; six, 2; of 156 instances in Latin, one occurs 39 times; two, 39; three, 32; four, 17; five, 8; six, 9; seven, 6; eight, 2; nine, 1; eleven, 2. In Anth. Lat. 390, a tour de force on strange matings, Eucheria declines a proposal of marriage in sixteen distichs containing twenty-eight *dōvvara*.

⁵ Using totals given in n. 4 above, the figures for Greek are: lyric (including elegy and epigram), 18 examples; epic, 7; tragedy, 5; comedy, 3; pastoral, 3; for Latin: lyric (including elegy and epigram), 82; epic, 28; tragedy, 15; comedy, 17; pastoral, 6.

in part to the attempt to compensate by its use for declining poetic powers.

Hyperbolic expressions of various patterns in terms of the impossible are frequent in all languages, with a tendency toward proverbial or quasi-proverbial form. Their origin is doubtless to be found in popular speech, as a part of folk-wisdom emanating from early observation and reflection on nature and her immutable or slowly changing laws. The figure *ἀδύνατον*, or at least one type of it, with its earliest traceable emergence into literature goes back to the formality and solemnity of legal and religious usage, as was seen in examples from Homer, Herodotus, and Sophocles. The simpler and earlier types were taken up and much elaborated for rhetorical purposes by Greek and Latin writers and in the rhetorical schools (see Sen. Rhet. Contr. I, 5, 2). Classical models have of course been widely imitated in modern literatures.

H. V. CANTER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

DIE ALTNORDISCHE SENKUNG $\ddot{i} : \ddot{u} > \dot{e} : \dot{o}$ VOR kk , pp UND tt (AUS $*nk$, $*mp$, $*nt$ ASSIMILIERT).

[The "sinking" $\ddot{i} > \dot{e}$ and $\ddot{u} > \dot{o}$ before pp , kk and tt was not due to a -umlaut but to the disappearance of the nasal before p , k and t . The "sinking" occurred before an a of the end syllable but not before an $i(\dot{i})$ or u of the end syllable.

The e in *nema* is due to a -umlaut; the e in *drekka* to "sinking".]

I.

Die Senkung¹ $\ddot{i} : \ddot{u} > \dot{e} : \dot{o}$ in ihrem Verhältnis zu dem A-Umlaut

Im Anord. sind die Nasale m (vor p) und n (vor k und vor t) zu resp. pp , kk und tt assimiliert worden; nach der Assimilation ist dann ursprüngliches \ddot{i} und ursprüngliches \ddot{u} in resp. \dot{e} und \dot{o} übergegangen, ausser wenn zur Zeit des Nasalschwundes entweder ein $i(\dot{i})$ oder ein u in der folgenden Silbe gestanden hatte, so z.B.

1a) anord. $\ddot{e}(\emptyset)$ aus urgerm. \ddot{i} gegen ein ursprüngliches a der Endsilbe

urgerm. $*drink-an =$ got. *drigk-an* > anord. *drekka*

urgerm. $*sinkw-an =$ got. *sigq-an* > anord. *søkkv-a* (aus älterem $*sekkw-a$ mit w -Umlaut des e)

1b) anord. \ddot{o} aus urgerm. \ddot{u} gegen ein ursprüngliches a der Endsilbe

urgerm. $*sunkw-an-z >$ got. *sugq-an-s* > anord. *sokk-inn*

urgerm. $*unk-ar =$ got. *ugk-ar* > anord. *okk-ar*.

2a) anord. $\ddot{i}(y)$ = urgerm. \ddot{i} gegen ein ursprüngliches i^2 der Endsilbe

urgerm. $*inkw-iz >$ got. *igq-is* > anord. *ykkar³* (aus älterem $*inkwiR > *ikkwiR$ mit w -Umlaut des i)

2b) anord. $\ddot{u}(y)$ = urgerm. \ddot{u} gegen ein ursprüngliches $i(\dot{i})$ oder ein ursprüngliches u der Endsilbe

¹ Den Übergang $\ddot{i} : \ddot{u} > \dot{e} : \dot{o}$ vor den aus $*nk$, $*mp$, $*nt$ assimilierten kk , pp , tt nennt man gewöhnlich "Senkung." Früher benutzte man für "Senkung" auch den Ausdruck "Trübung" (vgl. Holthausen, *Aisl. Elementarb.*, S. 11, 2. Kap. *Trübung*).

² Leider ist kein Beispiel eines urgerm. i der Stammsilbe gegen ein ursprüngliches u der Endsilbe belegt.

³ Anord. *ykkar* Gen. plur. (got. *igqara*) statt lautgerechtes **økkuar* ($< *ekkuar < *ikkuar$) ist Neubildung nach dem Dat. plur. *ykkar*.

urgerm. **sunkw-um* = got. *sugg-um* > anord. *sukk-um*

urgerm. **punk-ian* = got. *pugk-jan* > anord. *þykk-ja* (mit *j*-Umlaut des *u*)

Man sieht also, dass die Senkung *i* : *ü* > *ě* : *ö* in ursprünglich mehrsilbigen Wörtern unter gleichen Bedingungen wie der *a*-Umlaut von *i* : *ü* entstanden ist, d.h. erst wenn zur Zeit des Nasalschwundes ein *a*-Laut in der folgenden Silbe gestanden hatte. Doch weisen die ursprünglich einsilbigen Wörter, z.B. *vetr⁴* (< **vittr* < **vintR*), *okkr* (< **ukk-* < **unk-* = got. **ugk* (as.-ags. *un(k)c*) mit analogischem *-r* aus *ykk-r* = got. *igqis*), darauf hin, dass die Senkung *i* : *ü* > *ě* : *ö* als ein junger, speziell nordischer Lautwandel anzusehen ist, der nichts mit der *a*-Brechung zu tun hat, sondern mit dem Übergang eines *i* : *ü* in *ě* : *ö* (mit Ersatzdehnung *é* : *ó*) sonst vor geschwundenem Nasal (vgl. got. *þrins* > anord. *þré*, got. *uns* > anord. *ós*) auf einer Stufe steht.

Bei der Behauptung, das *e* in *drekka* wäre durch den *a*-Umlaut hervorgerufen, hat sich Holtzmann⁵ durch den Umstand irreführen lassen, dass die Endsilbe ein *a* enthält. Nach Massgabe der einsilbigen Wörter ist beim mehrsilbigen Typus *drekka* der *a*-Umlaut nicht eingetreten, sondern der gesenkte Vokal *ě* (vgl. *vettr*, *okkr*, usw.) ist im Einklang mit dem *a* der Endsilbe unverändert geblieben. Zwar ist es beim Typus *drekka* für praktische Zwecke ganz gleichgültig, ob man den Vokal *e* der Senkung oder dem *a*-Umlaut zuschreibt, denn hier laufen ja die

⁴ Ebenso sind die einsilbigen Subst. *klettr* (aschw. *klinter*), *kleppr* (aschw. *klimper*), *rekkr* (ags. *rinc*) der *a*-Flexion zu beurteilen, doch liefern dieselben keinen endgültigen Beweis für die Senkung als selbständigen Lautwandel, der mit dem *a*-Umlaut nichts zu tun hat, da bei den einsilbigen Subst. der gebrochene Stammvokal aus den mehrsilbigen Formen mit *a* der Endsilbe erklärt werden könnte, so z.B. *vettr* aus *vett-ar* Gen. sg., oder *klettr* : *rekkr* aus *klett-a(r)* : *rekk-a(r)* Plur. Ebenso wäre es möglich, das *o* in *okkr* (< **ukk-* < **unk-* = got. **ugk*, mit *-r* aus *ykk-r* = got. *igqis*) als Anlehnung an das *o* in *okkar* Gen. plur. (= got. **uggara*) zu erklären. Es steht aber nichts im Wege anzunehmen, dass das *e* in *vettr*, *klettr*, *kleppr*, *rekkr*, usw., sowohl wie auch das *o* in *okkr*, lautgerecht entwickelt, d.h. dem Schwund des Nasals (= Senkung) und nicht dem *a*-Umlaut zuzuschreiben ist.

⁵ Vgl. A. Holtzmann, *Altd. Gram.*, I, 1, "Anord. Lautlehre", S. 75: "Da in *drigkan*, d.i. *drekka* der *A*-Umlaut eintritt, so kann auch in *sigkvan*, d.i. *sökkva*, *i* nicht *y* werden."

beiden Vorgänge auf dasselbe hinaus. Richtig aber ist Holtzmanns Standpunkt hier über den *a*-Umlaut nicht, denn bei dem *a*-Umlaut handelt sich um ein gemeinnord.- und westgerm. *ě* : *ö* (vgl. got. *wigôs* : *fuglôs* > anord. *vegar* : *foglar*, ahd. *wega* : *fogala*), während es sich bei der Senkung um ein sekundäres (durch Schwund des Nasals hervorgerufenes), speziell nordgerm. *ě* : *ö* (= westgerm. *i* : *ü*) handelt.

Andrerseits muss man den Umstand in Erwägung ziehen, dass im Nordgerm., ebenso wie im Westgerm., ein *ě* : *ö* der Stammstilbe sich nicht lautgerecht mit einem *i*(*î*) oder einem *u* der Endsilbe verträgt, weshalb die gesenkten Vokale gegen ein *i*(*î*) oder ein *u* der Endsilbe nicht entstanden sind. Holthausen,⁶ Dieter u.a. sind also gewiss im Unrecht, wenn sie bei der Senkung dieses Verhältnis zwischen dem Stammvokal und dem Vokal der Endsilbe nicht gelten lassen, sondern den unveränderten Stammvokal *i* : *ü* (gegen ein *i*(*î*) oder ein *u* der Endsilbe) überall entweder der Analogiewirkung oder der Unbetontheit zuschreiben. Übrigens liegt überhaupt kein Grund vor, anzunehmen, dass ein *i* : *ü* der Stammsilbe vor den aus **nk*, **mp*, **nt* assimilierten *kk*, *pp*, *tt* gegen ein *i*(*î*) oder ein *u* der Endsilbe je in *ě* : *ö* übergegangen ist, denn eine solche Annahme streitet ja gegen die im Nord.- und Westgerm. allgemein gültige Regel über das Verhältnis zwischen dem Stammvokal und dem Vokal der Endsilbe.

II.

Das Verhältnis von dem e in dem Typus drekka zu dem e in dem Typus aisl. nema

Nach der herkömmlichen Ansicht soll das *ě* in nord.- und westgerm. (as.-ahd.) *nema(n)* auf urgerm. *ě* zurückgehen.

⁶ Vgl. F. Holthausen, *op. cit.*, § 25, Anm.: "pykkja dünen ist wol wegen seiner häufigen Unbetontheit als eingeschobener Satzteil (*pykkir mér dünt mir u.a.*) der Regel nicht unterworfen."

Diese "Regel" lautet bei Holthausen (*ebend.*, § 25) folgendermassen: "Vor *nk*, *nt* und *mp*, die zu *kk*, *tt*, *pp* assimiliert werden, geht *i* in *e*, *u* in *o* über,"

Holthausens Regel über die "Vokaltrübung" berücksichtigt also überhaupt nicht die hemmende Wirkung eines *i*, *j* oder eines *u* der Endsilbe, wonach er gezwungen ist (*ebend.*, § 239, Anm. 2) z.B. die Form *sukkum* als "eine analogische Neubildung statt **sokkum*" zu erklären. Der Auffassung Holthausens stimmt Dieter (*Die Laut- und Formenlehre der altgerm. Dialekte*, S. 47, § 36, b und Anm.) bei.

Doch lehrt got. *niman*, sowohl wie auch westgerm. (as.-ags.) *niman*, dass hier das *i* älter sein muss, als das *e* in nord.- und westgerm. *nema(n)*. Im Westgerm. hat sich bei as.-ahd. *neman* die *a*-Brechung des alten *i* geltend gemacht, während bei as.-ags. *niman* die *a*-Brechung durch den folgenden Nasallaut gehemmt worden ist. Dem westgerm. *neman* nach würde man also das *e* in aisl. *nema* gleichfalls der *a*-Brechung zuschreiben. Merkwürdig ist es aber, dass im Aisl. das Part. prät. regelmässig *numinn*⁷ (statt *nominn*) ohne *a*-Brechung des alten *u* lautet gegenüber *nema* Inf. mit gebrochenem Stammvokal. Es liegt also im Aisl. zwischen dem Inf. *nema* und dem Part. prät. *numinn* eine Dissonanz des Vokalismus vor, die im Westgerm. scheinbar nicht vorhanden ist,⁸ denn da im Westgerm., wo sich Brechung im Inf. vorfindet, liegt ebenfalls im Part. prät. Brechung vor, wenn die Häufigkeit der Brechung in den beiden Fällen (d.h. im Inf. und im Part. prät.) auch nicht gleichmässig erscheint.

Gotisch

*niman**numans*

Westgerm.

Ags. *niman**-numen*As. *niman* (häufig)*-noman* (häufig)As. *neman* (selten)*-numan* (selten)Ahd. *neman**gi-noman*

Nordgerm.

Aisl. *nema**numinn*

**nima* fehlt auf dem ganzen nordgerm. Gebiete; aisl. *nominn* (= anorw. *nominn*), höchst selten und wohl jungen Ursprungs nach Massgabe von *nema*; mit diesem *nominn* (anorw.?) haben wir so gut wie nicht zu rechnen (vgl. *Fussn.* 7).

Aus dieser Dissonanz des Vokalismus zwischen *nema* (mit gebrochenem Stammvokal) und *numinn* (mit dem alten unge-

⁷ Es liegt auch ein sehr seltenes aisl. *nominn* (= anorw. *nominn*) vor; vgl. A. Noreen, *op. cit.*, § 496. Dieses unregelmässige *nominn* ist aber vielleicht Entlehnung aus dem Anorw. Jedenfalls ist die Form *nominn* eine Umbildung des regelmässigen *numinn* wohl nach Massgabe des Präs. *nema* mit gebrochenem Stammvokal.

⁸ Eine gleiche Dissonanz des Vokalismus liegt doch im As. zwischen *neman* Inf. und *-numan* Part. prät., sowohl wie auch zwischen *niman* Inf. und *-noman* Part. prät., vor.

brochenen Stammvokal) im Aisl. gegenüber der scheinbar entsprechenden Vokalharmonie im Westgerm. wäre man anscheinend berechtigt zu folgern, dass das *e* im Inf. *nema* nicht dem *a*-Umlaut zuzuschreiben wäre, sondern mit dem *e* in dem Typus *drekka* auf einer Stufe stünde, indem das *e* in *nema*, ebenso wie das *e* in *drekka*, einen jungen, speziell nordischen Übergang des alten *i* in *ē* darstelle, der nichts mit dem *a*-Umlaut zu tun habe. Wir haben aber schon gesehen, dass bei der Vokalsenkung altes *i* und altes *ū* gleich behandelt werden; dass also das *o* im Part. prät. des Typus *drekka* (vgl. *drottinn*, *kroppinn*, *sokkinn* usw.) lautgerecht ist. Gegenüber dem regelmässigen *u* in *numinn* würde uns also die Annahme eines jungen, speziell nordischen Übergangs des *i* > *ē* im Inf. *nema* nicht aus der Not helfen, denn bei dieser Annahme wäre es zu erwarten, dass altes *u* denselben Weg wie altes *i* einschlagen sollte (d.h. vor einfachem Nasal gegen ein ursprüngliches *a* der Endsilbe in *o* übergehen sollte), ebenso wie bei der Annahme des *a*-Umlautes.

Das Erscheinen des alten *u* vor einfachem Nasal in *numinn* gegenüber dem gebrochenen Vokal *e* in *nema* erkläre ich aus dem Umstände, dass bei den synkopierten Kasus des Part. prät. das *u* vor *Nasal + Kons.* zu stehen kam (vgl. *numnu(m)*, *numnir*, u.a.), wobei das *u* durch Ausgleichung verallgemeinert wurde.⁹

Demnach wäre das *u* in *numinn*, *suminn*, wo es vor einfachem Nasal steht, ein analogisches *u* aus den synkopierten Kasus verallgemeinert; lautgerechtes **nominn* (< **nom-an-* < **num-an-*) wäre dann dem neugebildeten *numinn* gewichen, was die Dissonanz des Vokalismus zwischen *nema* und *numinn* erklären könnte.

Dass altes *u* vor einfachem Nasal gegen ein *a* der Endsilbe lautgerecht in *o* übergeht, beweist schon aisl. *koma*¹⁰ neben

⁹ Vgl. Axel Kock, "Der A-Umlaut in den altnord. Sprachen", *P. B. Beitr.*, XXIII, S. 515 f.

¹⁰ Vgl. z.B. *son-ar* Gen. sg. 'Sohn', woher *sonr* Nom. sg. neben lautgerechtem *sunr* (< **sun-uR* = got. *sunus*), oder *kon-ar* Gen. sg. 'Geschlechtsangehöriger', woher *konr* Nom. sg. (statt lautgerechtes **kunr* < **kuniR* = got. *-kuns*) mit durchgeföhrt Stammvokal *o*. An *konr* lehnt sich wohl das *o* in *kon-ungr* an (vgl. Hermann Collitz, "Sunufatarungo", *J. E. Germ. Philol.*, XXI, S. 565, 1922); ein Umstand, der noch weiter auf die Übertragung des gebrochenen Vokals auf der Bedeutung nach nahe verwandte Wörter hinweist (vgl. das *o* in *kominn* aus *koma* Inf.).

dem älteren, schon im Absterben begriffenen aisl. *kuma* Inf. Das *o* im Inf. *koma*, ebenso wie das *o* im Part. prät. **nominn*, steht offenbar mit dem *e* in *nema* auf gleicher Stufe. Der Umstand aber, dass die Partizipialform aisl. *kominn* (neben dem seltneren *kuminn* = anorw. *kuminn*) regelmässig vorliegt (dagegen fast immer *numinn*), lässt sich daraus erklären, dass das *o* im Part. prät. *kominn* aus dem Inf. *koma* entlehnt ist. Die Form *kominn* stellt also nicht die ursprüngliche Gestaltung des Part. prät. nom. sg. mask. (cf. **nominn* < **nom-anR*) dar, sondern ist jungen Ursprungs, wenn auch mit dem alten Part. prät. gleichlautend. Die Entlehnung des *o* in *kominn* Part. prät. aus dem Inf. *koma* ist wohl durch den Umstand begünstigt worden, dass dem Inf. und dem Part. prät. gleicher Stammvokal (d.h. **u*) zugrunde liegt, ebenso wie bei dem Typus *troða* : *troðinn*, *sofa* : *sofnn*. Nach dem Muster von diesen Verben hätte das *o* im Inf. *koma* desto leichter ins Part. prät. an Stelle des *u* (d.h. *kuminn* wird durch *kominn* ersetzt) eintreten können.

Bemerkenswert ist es aber, dass neben *nema* keine Form **nima*¹¹ auf dem ganzen Gebiete des Anord. begegnet, während doch dem aisl. *koma* altes *kuma* (= anorw. *kuma*) zur Seite steht. Aus diesem Umstand wäre man scheinbar berechtigt zu folgern, dass altes *i* vor einfacherem Nasal etwas früher als altes *u* vor einfacherem Nasal von der *a*-Brechung angegriffen worden sei. Das Beibehalten des alten *u* in *kuma* Inf. ist aber wohl durch das Beispiel des *u* in *kuminn* Part. prät. (das gerade wie *numinn* zu erklären ist) begünstigt worden,¹² indem anscheinend

¹¹ Das *i* in *suima* (*symja*), Part. prät. *suminn*, statt *e* (**suema*) ist wohl aus der Nebenform mit Doppelnasal *sui-mm-a* zu erklären. Die Form *suima* beweist also nichts gegen die Annahme, dass altes *i* vor einfacherem Nasal gegen ein *o* der Endsilbe lautgerecht in *e* übergeht.

Aus den Inf. *brenna*, *renna* (Part. prät. *brunninn*, *runninn*) neben älteren *brinna*, *rinna* lässt sich auch erschliessen, dass in der ursprünglichen Flexion dieser Verba *-nn-* mit *-n-* (d.h. **bre-n-a*, **re-n-a*, mit *bri-nn-a*, *ri-nn-a*) gewechselt habe (vgl. Noreen, op. cit., § 162, 1). Es wird hier aber wohl der Einfluss der Kausativa *brenna*, *renna* (= got. *-brannjan*, *-rannjan*) den Ausschlag gegeben haben.

¹² Hiermit soll aber nicht gesagt sein, dass einfacher Nasal die Wirkung des *a*-Umlautes nicht verhindern konnte. Er hat sie wohl *nicht ganz*, sondern *nur vorläufig* verhindert, denn die hemmende Wirkung des einfachen Nasals auf altes *u* und auf altes *i* ist wohl erst allmählich der Wirkung des *a*-Umlautes gewichen. So ist im Aisl. ein *o* statt *u*

die Neigung vorlag, den Stammvokal des Inf. und den Stammvokal des Part. prät. gleich zu halten.¹³ Altes *kuma* ist also durch den Einfluss von *kuminn* trotz des jüngeren *koma* beibehalten worden während altes **nima* dem jüngeren *nema* ganz und gar Platz gemacht hat, da beim Verbum **nima* keine gegenseitige Beeinflussung zwischen dem Inf. und dem Part. prät. auf Grund des gleichen Stammvokals stattgefunden hat.

Es liegt also meiner Ansicht nach kein zwingender Grund vor, anzunehmen, dass altes *i*, sowohl wie auch altes *ü*, vor einfacherem Nasal gegen ein ursprüngliches *a* der Endsilbe nicht lautgerecht in den entsprechenden gebrochenen Vokal (d.h. *ě* : *ö*) übergeht, oder dass dieser Vorgang (d.h. der *a*-Umlaut) von dem gleichen Vorgang im Westgerm. zu trennen ist.

Einen Überblick auf die Lautverhältnisse bei aisl. *kuma* : *kuminn*, *koma* : *kominn*, *nema* : *numinn* gewährt vielleicht das folgende Schema:

kuma (mit altem *u* durch Einfluss von *kuminn* bewahrt)

koma (altes *u* > *o* durch *a*-Umlaut hervorgerufen)

kuminn (hat altes **kominn* < **kom-an-* durch Systemzwang in der Flexion ersetzt, d.h. von denjenigen Kasus aus, wo *u* vor *m* + Kons. zu stehen kam)

kominn (mit *o* aus dem Inf. *koma* entlehnt, mit altem **kominn* < **kom-an-* gleichlautend)

nema (altes *i* > *e* durch *a*-Umlaut hervorgerufen, mit *koma* auf einer Stufe stehend)

numinn (hat altes **nominn* < **nom-an-* durch Systemzwang ersetzt, mit *kuminn* auf einer Stufe stehend)

Weiter ist beim Verbum *nema* in Erwägung zu ziehen, dass im Paradigma des Präs. das lautgerechte Verhältnis zwischen dem alten *i* der Stammsilbe und dem **u* : **i* der Endsilbe

vor einfacherem Nasal gegen ein *a* der Endsilbe, gerade wie im Westgerm., zu erklären, d.h. die *a*-Brechung ist auch hier (manchmal unter Mitwirkung der Ausgleichung) schliesslich zur Geltung gekommen. Was die *a*-Brechung des *u* : *i* vor einfacherem Nasal betrifft, steht das Anord.—As. offenbar als Übergangsstadium zwischen einerseits dem Ags. (= dem Got.) und andererseits dem Ahd.

¹³ Vgl. as. *kuman* Inf.: -*kuman* Part. prät. gegenüber *niman* (*neman*) Inf.: -*noman* (-*numan*) Part. prät. Es liegt also auch im As. dieselbe Neigung wie im Aisl. vor, den Stammvokal altes *u* im Inf. und im Part. prät. gleich zu halten.

durch Ausgleichung völlig verwischt ist. Im As. hingegen lebte dieses Verhältnis noch immer fort (vgl. *nimu*, *nimis*, *nimid* gegenüber *aisl nem*, *nemr*, *nemr*), was das Überwiegen der Form *niman* vor dem jüngeren *neman* (also *niman* im Anschluss an die Formen *nimu*, *nimis*, *nimid*) im As. erklären kann. Da im As. der Vokal *a* der Ableitungssilbe *-an* des Part. prät. anscheinend nie Synkope erlitt,¹⁴ ist hier im Gegensatz zum Part. prät. des Anord. die *a*-Brechung (*-numan* > *-noman*) desto leichter zur Geltung gekommen. Hiermit lässt sich also der Umstand erklären, dass im As. altes *niman* Inf. mit *ungebrochenem* Stammvokal sich viel häufiger vorfindet als *neman* (ebenso *nimað* Ind. präs. plur. gegenüber *nemað*), während das umgekehrte Vokalverhältnis beim Part. prät. der Fall ist, d.h. *-noman* mit *gebrochenem* Stammvokal begegnet viel häufiger als *-numan*.¹⁵ Wir ersehen also aus dem As., ebenso wie aus dem Aisl., dass die Vokalharmonie zwischen dem Stammvokal des Inf. und dem Stammvokal des Part. prät. durch einzel-sprachliche Lautverhältnisse¹⁶ gestört werden kann.

Im Gegensatz zum As. hat im Aisl. das völlige Verwischen der Wirkung des **u* : **i* der Endsilbe auf den Stammvokal des Präs. *nema* dazu beigetragen, dass altes **nima* ganz und gar zu Gunsten des jüngeren *nema* aufgegeben worden ist. Im Part. prät. hingegen kam (gleichfalls im Gegensatz zum As.) der Vokal *u* infolge der Synkope häufig vor *Nasal + Kons.* zu stehen, was das Überwiegen der Form *numinn* vor der Form *nominn* (*nominn* ist spärlich belegt, vgl. *Fussn.* 7) gegenüber dem Überwiegen des as. *-noman* vor *-numan* erklären kann.

¹⁴ Vgl. J. Gallée, *As. Gramm.*, § 142; Ferd. Holthausen, *As. Gramm.*², § 138, 4.

¹⁵ Die Form *-numan* Part. prät. ist nur spärlich belegt (vgl. J. Gallée, *As. Gramm.*, § 394, Anm. 2), ebenso wie das *e* im Präsens *neman*, *nemad*, usw., sodass die normale Gestaltung des Verbums im As. als *niman* : *-noman* erscheint, wobei die Vokalharmonie, gerade wie bei aisl. *nema* : *numinn*, gestört worden ist.

¹⁶ Man vergleiche weiter aisl. *beðinn* Part. prät. zu *biða* ‘warten’ gegenüber ags. *-biden*, mhd. *ge-biten* der I. Ablautsreihe. Hier liegen dem Nord.- und Westgerm. **biðan* Inf.: **bið-an-* Part. prät. zugrunde. Im Aisl. ist also die Vokalharmonie zwischen dem Inf. und dem Part. prät. gestört, aber offenbar wegen spezifisch anord. Lautverhältnisse, nämlich durch Zusammenfallen des **bið-an* > **biðinn* Part. prät. mit dem Part. prät. *beðinn* zu *biðja* ‘biten’ der V. Ablautsreihe (vgl. Axel Kock, *P. B. Beitr.*, XXIII, S. 498).

Wir werden also das *e* in aisl. *nema* von dem *e* in *drekka* trennen dürfen, da das *e* in *nema* aus altem *i* trotz des folgenden Nasallautes wohl durch die Wirkung des *a* der Endsilbe (also durch den *a*-Umlaut, gerade wie im Westgerm.) entwickelt ist, während bei dem Typus *drekka* der Übergang des alten *i* in *e* durch Schwund des Nasals (also durch die "Vokalsenkung") hervorgerufen ist, wobei das aus dem Nasalschwund entstandene *e* im Einklang mit dem *a* der Endsilbe unverändert geblieben ist.

Weiter ist das *e* in aisl. *nema* wohl nicht von dem *e* in westgerm. (ahd.-as.) *neman* zu trennen. Der Umstand, dass das *e* in aisl. *nema* sich ebenso wenig mit dem *u* des Part. prät. *numinn*, wie mit dem *i* in westgerm. (as.-ags.) *niman*, verträgt, weist nicht auf einen speziell nordischen Übergang des *i* vor einfacherem Nasal in *e* hin, sondern diese Dissonanz des Vokalismus lässt sich, gerade wie im As. (d.h. *niman* Inf. gegenüber *-noman* Part. prät.), aus Anlehnung an diejenigen Formen erklären, wo der alte ungebrochene Stammvokal lautgerecht ist (z.B. aisl. *numinn* durch Anlehnung an *numnir* u.a., as. *niman* durch Anlehnung an *nimu*, *nimis* u.a.).

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS.

TWO MISUNDERSTOOD PASSAGES IN AESCHYLUS.

I.

κρηπὶς ὑπεστιν (*Persae* 815.)

Housman's impossible *ἀπέσβηκ'*, which presupposes a *κρηνίς*, based on Schütz's most improbable *ἐπιδύεται* at the end of the trimeter, leaves two small words intact—*ἀλλ' ἔτ'*. This is re-writing Aeschylus with a vengeance—a whole trimeter shrunk to this little measure!

Darius is telling the chorus that the Persians have wrought evil and are now suffering evil in equal measure—nay more, other evils are still in store for them, for not yet have their woes touched bottom:

κοῦδέπω κακῶν
κρηπὶς ὑπεστιν, ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἐπί τι δεύεται.

The manuscripts read *ἐκπαιδεύεται*. If the corruption came about by the dropping out of *τι* after *ἐπί*, we have here a curious case of what might be called *double haplographie*, as well as of *double entendre* (*ετ ετ τι τι*).¹ The remnant *δεύεται* attached itself to *ἐπί*, forming *ἐπιδεύεται*, which was mistaken for the word which appears in our text, since the first syllable had to be long, now that the tribrach had been converted into an iambus by the loss of *τι*. Similarly *ἀπὸ τίς ἐρεῖ* became *ἀποστερεῖ* in Euripides, *Hel.* 578, and *-μον ἄμα* became *-μον μὴ* in *Ag.* 304, as I shall show in the second part of this article.

The Persians have not yet reached the limit of their misfortunes: there is still something lacking to complete the tale—in both senses of the word. So the audience understands the lines as the actor says them. But when they hear the next two verses, *ἐπιδεύεται* takes on a new meaning, in which there is a certain irony:

τόσος γὰρ ἔσται πέλανος αἰματοσφαγῆς
πρὸς γῇ Πλαταιῶν Δωρίδος λόγχης ὑπο.

The ground on which the *κρηπὶς* stands is wet, soaked, drenched—but with a mass of clotted gore. The *κρηπὶς* has not settled, is not down on bed-rock.

¹ In *Cho.* 968 *ἀτᾶν* was mistaken for *ἄπαν*, and *Eum.* 393 *ἔτι* for *ἐπί*.

The form ἐπιδεύεται is not out of place in the *Persae*, a play so truly epic in spirit. In the messenger's speech an epic touch is added by the omission of the augment. Many of the Ionic words and forms are not found elsewhere. The Homeric prefixes ἀπι- and ἐπι- (*Pers.* 948, *Ag.* 1461) are never employed by Sophocles and Euripides. Apocope and syncope occur as in Homer. Long vowels are retained, and metrical lengthenings corresponding to the Homeric model are introduced (ἀθάνατος, ἴσονευρος). Epic-Ionic forms are found even in the trimeter (μοννῶπα, ἀείδω, ιθύνω, δήριος).²

The tribrach too (ἐπί τι) is thoroughly Aeschylean. Sophocles has only 446 resolutions in 7500 (melic) verses, Euripides 729 in 17,825, whereas Aeschylus has 2003 in 4000—an average of one in every two verses.

M. Mazon, who makes such sensible remarks about editing a Greek text,³ goes to the other extreme and—instead of re-writing Aeschylus—endeavors to explain the text as it stands: “l'édifice de leurs malheurs n'en est pas même à son soubassement et va grandir encore,” which looks very much like a translation of the scholiast's stupid αὐξέται.⁴ And it is rather difficult to see how ἐκπαιδεύεται could be applied to an edifice, or to a κρηπίς, for that matter, or even to κακά.

When Xenophon and his Ten Thousand came to Larisa (Nimrud), they found a wall, built of brick, twenty-five feet thick and a hundred feet high, but there was a foundation under it: κρηπίς δ' ὑπῆν λιθίνη τὸ ὕψος εἴκοσι ποδῶν (*An.* 3. 4. 7). But no solid κρηπίς ὑπεστὶ the myriad-piled woe of the Persians which Darius is describing to the chorus. The ἔδαφος is not fit for an edifice, will not sustain it, for the soil reeks with gore: the κρηπίς is still near the surface (ὑπό > < ἐπί>), is still sinking. The poet's mind darts ahead to τόσος γὰρ πέλανος as he writes ἐπιδεύεται.

² Cp. also ἔταρος, δεικής, πολιήτης, νοῦσος, οὐλόμενος, πτόλις, Ἀιδος, ἄμμι, ὑμμε, ἔθεν, σφίν, ἀμός, τεός, κεῖνος, θήν, βά, τώς, τίπτε, μάσσων, διδοῖ, βάσκε, ἡδέ, ὑπαῖ.

³ ESCHYLE, Introduction.

⁴ Has the brilliant French scholar mistaken αὐξέται for a future? If so, it is a mere slip, like his “qui contre tous les siens ne respire que guère sans trêve” (*Ag.* 1235). But slips like this should make it clear to us that our manuscripts are not flawless, *sans reproche*, and that we should attack the problems they present *sans peur—but also SANS LES RÉCRIRE*.

It is the reality of the plain of Plataea that prompts the selection of this verb. Aeschylus often combines a simile, or metaphor, with the actual expression, thus making the figure more definite; or he brings a metaphorical expression into the realm of reality and, by a sort of irony, breaks the illusion. More frequently he employs a simile instead of the real expression, counting upon the imagination of his audience to establish the correct relation.⁵

It is, indeed, possible that $\tau\acute{i}$ after $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\acute{i}$ never did drop out. In that case, $\epsilon\pi\acute{i}\delta\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\acute{a}\iota$ was mistaken for $\epsilon\pi\acute{i}\delta\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\acute{a}\iota$, which *had to* be changed to $\epsilon\kappa\pi\acute{i}\delta\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\acute{a}\iota$, ITI being misread AI:

Π Ι Τ Ι Δ Ε Υ Ε Τ Α Ι
Π Α Ι Δ Ε Υ Ε Τ Α Ι

Compare *Ag.* 1653, where *aιρούμεθα* became *έρονύμεθα* under the influence of the preceding *λέγεις*. In *Cho.* 45 ΙΑΛΛΕΙ was written ΜΙΑΛΛΕΙ. But IA would be mistaken for M⁶ much more easily than IT for A. Nevertheless, even this is possible in script, especially as II precedes and ΙΔΕΥΤΑΙ follows. What goes before, or after, often makes the scribe see something that does not actually stand in the text. So in *Cho.* 71 *θιγόντι* was misread *οίγοντι* before *νυμφικῶν ἔδωλίων*.

II.

μὴ χαρίζεσθαι (*Agamemnon* 304.)

No editor retains *χαρίζεσθαι*. Yet this is precisely the word which the context requires. Casaubon substituted *χρονίζεσθαι* (which is palaeographically most improbable) and he is followed by nearly all editors, in spite of the fact that it yields no plausible sense. Septem 54 has nothing to do with the case. I can conceive of urging a runner to *μὴ χρονίζεσθαι*, but what in the world does *θεσμὸν μὴ χρονίζεσθαι* mean? Just below, of course, we have *τοιοίδε . . . νόμοι*, but by no stretch of the imagination can this be considered analogous to *ώτρυνε θεσμόν*.

⁵ For *δεύεται* compare N 655 *ἐκ δ' αἷμα μέλαν ρέε,* *δεῦε δὲ γαῖαν*, ψ 220, B 471, I 570, P 360, ε 53, Eur. *Ph.* 674, Xen. *Oec.* 10. 11, *Cyr.* 6. 2. 28, Soph. *Ai.* 376. The active *έπιδεύειν* also means *to moisten on the surface*. With *έπιδεύεσθαι*, *to lack*, compare the poetic and Ionic adjective *έπιδευής*.

⁶ Probably A simply dropped out (as TI in the passage I am discussing), since *μ* precedes.

Margoliouth tries to combine $\mu\eta$ with $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha i$ to form a new infinitive: $\mu\eta\chi\alpha\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha i$. But no scribe would have mistaken $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha i$ for $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha i$, especially when joined to a preceding $\mu\eta$.

Our text is correct, with the sole exception of $\mu\eta$, which no scholar attempts to emend; and it is right here that I find the seat of the corruption.

One syllable dropped out, because it formed the second mora of a tribrach. Then the truncated and meaningless μa was changed to $\mu\eta$ —to make an iambus and apparent sense (as a negative with the infinitive). But $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha i$ now became nonsensical, since it is a positive statement that the context demands.

The light of the beacon that reached Aegiplanctus roused another great blaze *at once, immediately* upon its arrival. No sooner was the gleam from the beacon from Gorgopis perceived by the warders on Mount Aegiplanctus than another great flame shot skyward:

$\delta\rho\rho s \tau' \dot{\epsilon}\pi' \Lambda\dot{\iota}\gamma\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha\gamma\kappa t o v \dot{\epsilon}\acute{\xi}i k n o \acute{u} m e v o n$
 $\ddot{\omega}\tau\rho v v' \ddot{\epsilon}\theta' \acute{\epsilon} s m \acute{o} n \acute{\alpha} m a \chi\alpha\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha i \pi v \rho \acute{o} s .$

Here the flambeau is called a *swarm* of fire; in the next sentence it is a *great beard* of flame:

$\pi\acute{e}m p o n o s i \delta' \acute{a}n d a i o n t e s \acute{a}f \theta \acute{o} n \varphi \mu e n e i$
 $\phi l o g \acute{o} s \mu e g a n \pi \acute{a}g w n a .$

A wild sensuality and a very vivid personification run through this whole description of the relaying of messages. With $\ddot{\omega}\tau\rho v v$ in 304 compare $\dot{\eta}\gamma e i r e v$ in 299. Observe also the position of the verbs: $\dot{\epsilon}p e m p e v$ (283), $\pi e f \acute{r} i k e$ (288), $\ddot{\omega}\tau\rho v v$ (304), $\pi e m p o n o s i$ (305)—all at the beginning of the verse. There is no lacuna after 287, though practically all editors follow Casaubon in assuming one. Mazon remarks: “‘la torche’ ($\pi e \acute{u} k \eta$), après le flambeau ($\lambda a u p t \acute{a} s$), en est une preuve certaine.” A proof, yes—but of a corruption, not of a lacuna. And it is $\pi e f \acute{r} i k e$ that harmonizes with the preceding $\pi r \acute{o} s \dot{\eta} d o n \acute{h} \eta$. The corruption is due to a Sprachfehler: ρ was inadvertently omitted in rapid writing and $\pi e f \acute{r} i k e$ (or $\pi e f k e$) became $\pi e \acute{u} k \eta$ ($p e f k e$), $\tau \acute{o}$ being added *metri gratia*. The “sending on” of the message is expressed by the following participle $\pi a r a g y e \acute{l} a s a$, not by $\pi e m p e i$, which Sidgwick reads for $\pi e \acute{u} k \eta$. The delight of the flambeau-

bearers is that of real human beings: hence *πρὸς ἡδονὴν πέφρικε*, hence *χαρίζεσθαι*, *to give joyously, freely, bounteously*, as a *χάρις*. So *ἔσμόν* becomes the object of the infinitive, not of *ὤτρυνε* (*θεσμόν*).

The loss of *a* in *ἄμα* led to an incorrect division of the first three words of the trimeter. Certainly *ἔσμὸς πυρός* is no stranger an expression than *φλογὸς μέγαν πώγωνα*. All through Greek literature *ἔσμός* was used metaphorically for a large number (or quantity) of anything. Metrodorus employs it even of water: *πηροέειν ρόου ἔσμόν*. But the word is peculiarly appropriate in our passage, where the poet is describing the relay of beacon-signals, for *ἔσμὸς δῆλοι μὲν τὴν βοτρυδὸν συνίζησιν τῶν μελισσῶν* (Eustathius 58. 72). We find in Eur. *Bacch.* 710 even *γάλακτος ἔσμούς*. Like the Latin *examen*, *ἔσμός* was used to express a *copia* of anything: *ἴππων, γυναικῶν, τέκνων, ἀγαθῶν, κακῶν, πληγῶν, μητροτενόντων, μελιττῶν, ὄπώρας*. We find even *σωρὸς καὶ ἔσμὸς σοφίας* (Themist. *Or.* 29. 345D). Cp. Aesch. *Suppl.* 30 f. *ἀρσενοπληθῆ | δ' ἔσμὸν ὑβριστὴν Αἰγυπτογενῆ, 223 πελειάδων, 683 νούσων, Plato, Rep. 450B, Athen. 10. 432C τόν τε γῆς ἀπ' Ἀτθίδος ἔσμὸν μελίσσης τῆς ἀκραχόλου γλυκύν*. If one can say “a swarm of honey,” or “of milk,” one can certainly say also *ἔσμὸν πυρός*.

That an inadvertent omission of a letter is one of the commonest sources of corruption is proved not only by the numerous cases in our Greek manuscripts but also by actual experience. I have had occasion to write the whole of Aeschylus and of Sophocles, and a great part of Euripides; and I did not use a typewriter. When I went over my manuscript a second time, I was amazed at the number of errors. Even in the second revision I found that many mistakes of transcription remained in the text.

Sometimes the scribe pronounces a letter to himself and writes another which sounds like it. In *Suppl.* 518 we have a curious combination of errors resulting from metathesis and mispronunciation: *πιετῷ* is a mistake (by transposition of *ει*) for *πειτῷ*, which was due to a Sprachfehler (*φειτῷ*), and this to itacism. Yet editors continue to print *στείχω*, a conjecture, which, of course, makes sense—but it is Weil, not Aeschylus. In editing a Greek text we should not depart from the reading of the manuscripts and substitute a word which we think the poet *might* have employed, in spite of the fact that it bears little or

no resemblance to the traditional reading. As Mazon says, *Le rôle d'un éditeur consiste à établir très exactement la tradition du texte qu'il publie.* In hundreds of verses to-day the student is reading, not Aeschylus, Sophocles, or Euripides, but Wecklein, Weil, Wilamowitz, or some other European savant. The true text is never very unlike what we find in our manuscripts. I am still unconvinced that even Pearson's *τεθηγμένος* (*Suppl.* 186), which Wecklein characterized as "sicher" in dismissing my conjecture *μεθειμένος*,⁷ is the correct reading, though adopted by practically all editors. Indeed, *τεθηγμένος* is very "unsicher." In the first place, it is not likely that a scribe would have mistaken *τεθηγμένος* (especially in such a context) and written *τεθειμένος*. In the second place, *τεθηγμένος ὡμῇ ξὺν ὄργῃ* is questionable Greek: it is not *ὄργῃ συντεθηγμένος φρένας* (*Eur. Hipp.* 689). The prepositional phrase is placed between the participle and the verb for a specific reason. The army is seen approaching by the fugitives and the question in Danaus' mind is whether it started *ἀπήμων* (*with harmless intent*) or was let loose with savage fury and is now flowing toward them like a great flood that has burst its barriers. The true parallel to the passage is found in *Septem* 79-85: *μεθεῖται στρατός · στρατόπεδον λιπῶν | ρεῖ πολὺς ὅδε λεώς πρόδρομος ἵππότας . . . βρέμει δ' | ἀμαχέτον δίκαν ὕδατος ὄροτύπου.* So the interpretation of the scholiast: *τὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς στόλον μετὰ ὄρμῆς ποιεῖται.* Finally, *μεθειμένος* could easily be mistaken for the perfect passive participle of the common verb *τίθημι*, especially as *μ*, in some script, is not so very unlike *τ*. So *ἀρκυστάτων* in *Eum.* 112 was written *ἀρκυσμάτων*, and (as I believe) *τίτην* (203) was copied as *τί μήν*; Cp. *Suppl.* 918, where *τᾶμ' ὀλωλόθ'* was converted into *τ' ἀπολωλόθ'* (*μ* to *π*). Doubtless many examples could be found in the whole corpus of the tragic poets.

J. E. HARRY.

ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

⁷ I found out later that I had been anticipated by Klausen.

PREDICATING PERIODS IN LATIN.

[Predicating periods, involving a judgment of the form "A is B", are not confined to the *cum*-construction; they may be conditional, relative, etc. The effect of the relation upon the mood of the *cum*-clause is well known; attention is now called to the effect upon the tense of the infinitive when the predicating period falls into indirect discourse.]

Cicero, *in Cat.* i. 20 ff.: *Quid est? . . . eequid animadvertis horum silentium? Patiuntur, tacent. . . . At si hoc idem huic adulescenti optimo P. Sestio . . . dixisset, iam mihi consuli hoc ipso in templo senatus iure optimo vim et manus intulisset. De te autem, Catilina, cum quiescant, probant, cum patiuntur, decernunt, cum tacent, clamant.*

In the closing words of the familiar passage here cited, Cicero picks up the preceding *Patiuntur, tacent*, and tells what this attitude of the senators means, i. e., "their quietness means approval, their impassivity is a decree, their silence a shout."

Underlying such combinations as *cum tacent, clamant* is a judgment of the form "A is B," the whole forming a "Predicating Period," so called because the main clause (corresponding to B) serves as a predicate to tell what A is. Analogous predicating periods appear in other forms; e. g.

si amant, sapienter faciunt
qui amant, sapienter faciunt¹

Everywhere there underlies the same judgment of the form "A is B"; and it is obvious that a proper understanding of all such sentences requires that they be treated as units.

There would probably be need to say little more in this connection, were it not for the fact that the syntax of *cum* has been made the subject of special study and long controversy, with a residuum of error strongly entrenched.

Thus, after recognizing a "Causal *Cum*-clause," a "Temporal *Cum*-clause," etc., it is a common practice to dismember predicating periods such as *cum tacent, clamant*, and to call the first

¹ The variety of possible forms is illustrated in an interesting way by Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* i. 52, where the nominative of the present participle and the *cum*-clause are used in successive predicating periods (*neque nos corpora sumus, nec ego tibi haec dicens corpori tuo dico. Cum igitur (Apollo) 'nosce te' dicit, hoc dicit: 'nosce animum tuum'*).

element an "Explanatory or Explicative *Cum*-clause," quite disregarding the fact that it is *clamant* that explains or defines, and not the opening phrase of the period.²

Incidentally, such procedure leads to the interpretation of *cum* as meaning "in that," a sense of the word nowhere established. It is much more likely that in a predicating period *cum* was felt much as temporal *cum*.³ Note the balance of *tum* in the following:

Cicero, *Phil.* vii. 11: Quid? *Cum* Brutum . . .
bellum gerentem cum Antonio . . . laudibus amplissi-
mis adfecistis, *tum* non hostem iudicastis Antonium?

Other evidence in support of this view has been set down elsewhere,⁴ and it is not necessary to rehearse it here. But it may be worth while to add an English illustration:

On returning from an evening's entertainment, two boys reported: "When we left, half of the gallery left," meaning that, at the start, there were four people in all in the gallery. Would they have thought of saying "*In that* we left, half of the gallery left?" So in Latin, there is no reason to suppose that *cum* departs from some standard meaning when it occurs in a predicating period.⁵

That the inner relation of the predicating period is a potent factor in syntax is most familiarly manifested in the persistence of the indicative mood in the *cum*-clauses of such periods, even

² There are better possibilities in the practice of those who speak of "clauses of coincident action" or "clauses of identical action"; for this looks toward recognition of the period as a unit.

³ In this connection interest may attach to certain gerundial phrases introduced by *in*, where the rendering "in" or "in the matter of" is in order; e. g.

Cicero, *ad Att.* iii. 15. 5: Caeci, caeci inquam fuimus *in vestitu mutando, in populo rogando*.

So Livy, xxxiv. 32. 6 ff.

⁴ University of California Publications in Classical Philology, VIII, 293 ff.

⁵ Bennett's Latin Grammar (290. 1) presents a strange medley. The caption is "Cum Explicative," and the sole example is *cum tacent, clamant*, which is rendered as a period ("their silence is a shout"), with the addition: "lit. *when* they are silent, they shout" (italics mine).

at a time when the subjunctive had come to dominate pretty generally in other *cum*-clauses using past tenses.⁶

A second and as yet unnoticed manifestation of the effect of this relation is found in predicating periods of the conditional type, examples of which follow:

Plautus, *Men.* 126:

Nam si foris cenat, profecto me, haud uxorem,
ulciscitur.

Cicero, *de Fin.* ii. 21: Idque si ita dicit, . . . dicit
absurde.

When sentences of this type appear in indirect discourse, the tense of the infinitive is apt to be affected. The examples noted are largely from Tacitus; e. g.

Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 36. 2: Augebat metum gnarus
Romanae seditionis et, si omitteretur ripa, *invasurus*
hostis: at si auxilia et socii adversum abscedentis
legiones armarentur, *civile bellum suscipi*.

Here is a military council considering ways and means of coping with a mutiny. The outlook is clearly prospective; yet something has leveled the infinitive to the present tense. That something seems to be the fact that the closing sentence is a predicating period, with underlying judgment of the form "A is B." Without reasoning the matter out in this way, the editors struggle through to a sense of the real meaning of the passage. Thus Furneaux: "that to arm the allies was to undertake civil war"; and Allen: "The present tense implies that calling out this levy, etc. would be in itself an act of civil war."

So in another sentence which has to do with the attitude of Thrasea Paetus toward the emperor:

Tacitus, *Ann.* xvi. 22. 2.: secessionem iam id et
partis et, si idem multi audeant, *bellum esse*.

The following passage is very similar, and even more interesting because, as soon as the predicating period is complete, the indirect discourse reverts to the normal future infinitive:

Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 76. 4: quod si regredieretur, ob-

⁶ Cf. the situation in Caesar's writings: University of California Publications in Classical Philology, V, 1 ff.

sistente Sentio civile bellum *incipi*; nec *duraturos*
 . . . centuriones. . . .⁷

Two sporadic examples cropping out in other authors are strikingly alike, except for the fact that in one of them the condition takes the form of an ablative absolute:

Sallust, *Bell. Cat.* 23. 5 ff.: Ea res in primis studia hominum accedit ad consulatum mandandum M. Tullio Ciceroni. Nam antea pleraque nobilitas invidia aestuabat, et quasi *pollui* consulatum credebant, si eum quamvis egregius homo novos adeptus foret. Sed ubi periculum advenit, invidia atque superbia post fuere.

Livy, i. 18. 5: Audito nomine Numae patres Romani, quamquam *inclinari* opes ad Sabinos, rege inde sumpto, videbantur, tamen . . . ad unum omnes Numae Pompilio regnum deferendum decernunt.

The first of these passages has to do with election prospects in the year 63, when the optimates generally felt that a victory for Cicero was tantamount to a degradation of the consular office. In the second example, it is a question of selecting a king. The Roman elders see that the choice of Numa means a transfer of the balance of power to the Sabine element; but they so vote, nevertheless.

In another sporadic instance the condition again takes the form of an ablative absolute:

Lucan, iv. 160 ff.:

quibus hoste potito
 Faucibus, *emitti* terrarum in devia Martem
 Inque feras gentes Caesar videt.

The writer of these lines would say that Caesar perceived that the attainment by the enemy of the goal in question meant wide expansion of the field of operations.

With the above examples using participial forms perhaps should be compared the following:

⁷ Though no condition is expressed, the same method of interpretation probably should be applied to the following:

Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 20. 2: sed disserebatur contra *suscipi* bellum avio itinere, importuoso mari.

Here Claudius is represented as consulting his advisers in regard to beginning operations in the East. They point out that (if he undertakes hostilities) it means war under difficult conditions.

Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 67. 1: *mox undique erumpendum;*
illa eruptione ad Rhenum perveniri.

In this passage the phrase *illa eruptione* refers to a recommended future action, and perhaps it may be regarded as standing roughly for a condition. Underlying there certainly is the suggestion of a judgment of the form "A is B." Frost catches this implication, as shown by his rendering: "this sally carries you to the Rhine."⁸

Apparently the leveling force of the predicating period is not confined to examples of the conditional type only. Compare an instance involving a *cum*-clause:

Caesar, *B. G.* v. 27. 10 ff.: *Illud se polliceri et iure
 iurando confirmare, tutum iter per finis daturum. Quod
 cum faciat, et civitati sese consulere, quod hibernis leve-
 tur, et Caesari pro eius meritis gratiam referre.*

At first sight it might seem doubtful here whether *Quod cum faciat* refers to making the promise or to the future activity of seeing the Romans safely out of the territory; but *quod hibernis levetur* seems conclusive for the second alternative. The shift of tense from *daturum* to *consulere* and *referre* therefore is significant.

It is possible also that the leveling effect of an underlying judgment of the form "A is B" may explain a passage long troublesome to editors, wherein the present infinitive seems to replace the perfect:

Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* i. 45: *Etenim si nunc aliquid
 adsequi se putant, qui ostium Ponti viderunt, . . .*

The form of this sentence shows variation, it is true; but certainly there is involved the judgment that having seen the mouth of the Pontus is a noteworthy experience.

In this brief paper it has been the chief aim to stress the importance of the inner relation of the predicating period as a factor in tense syntax, as illustrated by the behavior of the infinitive in indirect discourse. The present discussion of course touches only one aspect of this last named problem.

H. C. NUTTING.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

⁸ Cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv. 58. 5, where the future infinitive is followed by *quaeri* in connection with the phrase *tali consilio*.

A YALE PAPYRUS AND A RECONSIDERATION OF THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE YEAR 238 A. D.

[For summary see end of paper.]

New light on the chronology of the year 238 A.D. has been shed by the discovery in the Yale collection of Papyrus P 156, dated Pauni 26 (June 20) in the year of the first two Gordians. The text is as follows:

ρωμ[αν]ου σεμπρωνια[νου]
και μαρκον αντωνιου γορδι[ανου]
σεμπρωνιανου αφρικανου ευσεβων
ευτυχων σεβαστων παννι κς
αυρηλιος ιεραξ μεμισθωμα[ι
ως προκειται

The *Augusti* by whom this document is dated are clearly Marcus Antonius Gordianus and his son of the same name, who were *Augusti* for less than a month during the spring of 238 A. D. Since all previous calculations of the chronology of the year 238¹ have dated their period of rule as much earlier in 238 than that implied by the document at hand,² a reconsideration of the evidence for the chronology of that year is highly desirable.

Dr. Van Sickle has clearly demonstrated that the accession of Gordian III as *Augustus* probably took place on July 9, rather than August 7, as the present writer had hitherto maintained. The papyrus³ from the Arsinoite nome (Fayum), dated September 8 in the reign of Maximus and Balbinus as *Augusti* and Gordian as *Caesar*, can most easily be explained as an error on the part of the scribe, for dating by previous rulers is a mistake

¹ C. E. Van Sickle, "Some Further Observations on the Chronology of the Year 238 A. D.," *Classical Philology*, XXIV, 1929, 285 ff.; P. W. Townsend, "The Chronology of the Year 238 A. D.," *Yale Classical Studies*, I, 1928, 231 ff., where full bibliography is given.

² If they were *Augusti* in March or in April, it is scarcely probable that the news of their death had not reached the Fayum by the twentieth of June. Cf. Townsend, *op. cit.*, 232 f.

³ Preisigke, *Sammelbuch*, n. 5125; Wessely, *Stud. Pal.*, xx, p. 44, n. 51. Cf. Townsend, *op. cit.*, 232, note 9.

frequently encountered in the *papyri*. The tax return of Oxyrhynchus, dated in the month *Mesore* (July 25 to August 23) of the same sovereigns,⁴ suits the earlier date better than the later one. The evidence of the Alexandrian coins accords with either dating.⁵ The dates of the rescripts in the *Codex* of Justinian certainly point to a date earlier than August 7.⁶ Finally, the fact noted by Dr. Van Sickle that the interval between April 2, the day of the eclipse mentioned by the Augustan biographer, and July 9, the date given for the accession of Maximus and Balbinus, corresponds exactly to the ninety-nine days of the reign of the latter certainly indicates that the Augustan writer confused their death day and accession day.⁷ The day on which the new emperor was taken into the order of the Arval Brothers, namely the sixth day before the Ides of some month, may be July 9 as well as August 7.⁸ The coincidence between the former date and that of the Augustan biographer is clearly significant. There can be no reasonable doubt that July 9 is the most probable date for the accession of Gordian III as *Augustus*.

If the death of Maximus and Balbinus and the accession of Gordian III as *Augustus* occurred on July 9, 238 and their accession is to be dated on April 2, how is it possible that in a Fayum document of June 20 Gordian I and II still appear as *Augusti*? One possibility, of course, is that the writer of the document carelessly followed his former habit and continued to date by the previous rulers. Since the rule of the Gordians was so short, it is very unlikely that the habit of using their names had become so firmly fixed in the mind of an Egyptian scribe. Some other explanation should be sought. If the first two Gordians were killed in Africa in March, as Dr. Van Sickle supposes,⁹ it is highly improbable that the news of such a significant event had not yet reached the Fayum approximately

⁴ P. Oxy. 1433.

⁵ Townsend, *op. cit.*, 231 f.

⁶ Cf. Van Sickle, *op. cit.*, 288.

⁷ Capit. *Gord.*, 23. 2; Capit. *Max. et Balb.*, 1. 1. Cf. Van Sickle, *op. cit.*, 287 ff.

⁸ CIL, VI, 2113; Henzen, *Acta Arvalia*, pp. cxxiii, 106. The name of the month is missing from the inscription.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, 289.

three months later. If their accession and death occurred later than March, their principate must have been contemporary with the period of the rule of Maximus and Balbinus. Probably the latter rulers, who succeeded to the title of *Augustus* upon the receipt of the news of the death of the two Gordians, subsequently dated their accession from the time of their selection as leaders of the senatorial commission of twenty men. April 2, 238 would then not be the date of their elevation to the principate with the title of *Augustus*, but the day on which they were made chairmen of the senatorial commission of twenty.¹⁰ More than likely they received the distinguishing title of *Caesar* at that time.¹¹ If they dated their accession as April 2, that date must also represent the date of the recognition of Gordian I and II as *Augusti* by the Senate. The revolt would then have taken place in March.¹²

The biographer of Maximinus states that the letter of Gordian I to the Senate announcing his elevation in Africa was read at a meeting of that body on June 26.¹³ Zonaras states that the legates and letters sent by Gordian to the Senate were delayed by a storm at sea, while those sent to report the uprising to the Roman populace evidently arrived earlier.¹⁴ It is clear that the news reached Rome considerably before this date, for Gordian I and II were proclaimed *Augusti* by the Senate on April 2, and a popular demonstration against Maximinus took place at that time. The biographer of Maximinus does not state, however, that the Senate first learned of the uprising through the letters read on June 26, but indicates that the Gordians had been proclaimed *Augusti* some time before. Since they were killed at Carthage about April 22 or 24 after a brief reign of only twenty or twenty-two days, it cannot be assumed that the Senate was still unaware of that catastrophe two months later. The

¹⁰ Capit. *Gord.*, X. 1; XIV. 3; XXII. 1. Zos. I. 14.

¹¹ Zon. XII. 16. Zonaras suggests that they may have received the title *Caesar* from the Senate, which was ignorant of the designation of Gordian I and II as *Augusti*. The Senate knew of the revolt, however, as Zonaras himself indicates. The title *Caesar* naturally implied a high position but inferior to that of *Augustus*.

¹² Townsend, *op. cit.*, 235 f.

¹³ Capit. *Max.*, XVI. 1.

¹⁴ Zon., XII. 16.

date June 26 must be incorrect. Even if a textual error be supposed and the text changed to read "*VI Kal. Juniarum*" instead of "*VI Kal. Julianum*," the revised date May 27 would still be rather late for the arrival of the messengers and letters from Gordian to the Senate. Yet the date probably represents some real date, for the writer made use of the contemporary chronicler Dexippus, whose dates were probably generally correct. Perhaps here, as in the case of Maximus and Balbinus, the Augustan writer confused the dates of two events and assigned as the date of the arrival of the letters from Gordian a date which in reality belongs to the arrival of messengers announcing the death of the two Gordians in Africa. Since their death occurred about April 22 or 24, after a reign of only twenty or twenty-two days,¹⁵ it is more probable that the news arrived May 27 than June 26. If the news did not reach Rome before May 27, it is very probable that the inhabitants of the Fayum did not learn of their death until after June 20, the date of the Yale papyrus.¹⁶

May 27 seems to be a very plausible date for the proclamation of Maximus and Balbinus as *Augusti*, for Zonaras indicates that the period of their rule as *Augusti* was "not three complete months."¹⁷ If they received the title on May 27, they would have held it for parts of three months (May, June, and July), but "not three complete months." The date June 26 does not suit the meaning of these words of Zonaras. In view of this and the improbability that the news of the death of the Gordians reached Rome as late as June 26, it seems best to assume that a slight error has arisen in the text, and that the passage in question should be amended to read "*VI. Kal. Juniarum*."

It has been decisively demonstrated that the death of Maximinus occurred at Aquileia on May 10, 238.¹⁸

As the revised and correct chronology of the year 238 A. D. I would submit the following:

Beginning of the revolt in Africa ca. March 19.

¹⁵ Chron. *CCCLIIII* (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*), Auct. *Antiquiss.*, IX. 147; Zon. XII. 17; Townsend, *op. cit.*, 234-5.

¹⁶ Townsend, *op. cit.*, 232 ff.

¹⁷ Zon. XII. 17.

¹⁸ Townsend, *op. cit.*, 237; Van Sickle, *op. cit.*, 289.

- Proclamation of Gordian I and II as *Augusti*,
and
Selection of the senatorial board of twenty under
the leadership of Maximus and Balbinus . April 2.
Death of the Gordians in Africa ca. April 22-24.
Death of Maximinus May 10.
Maximus and Balbinus become *Augusti* May 27.
Death of Maximus and Balbinus:
Accession of Gordian III July 9.

P. W. TOWNSEND.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF LETTER 41 IN THE JULIO-BASILIAN CORRESPONDENCE.

[For summary see last paragraph.]

It is known that the Emperor Julian was acquainted with Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus at Athens, but there is no evidence that this was more than a mere acquaintanceship. In the collection of St. Basil's letters, two letters, 39 and 40, are represented as from Julian to St. Basil, and one, Letter 41, as from St. Basil to Julian. Three questions arise relative to this Julio-Basilian Correspondence; viz., 1) whether Letter 40 was written by Julian; 2) whether Letter 41 was written by St. Basil; and 3) whether Letter 39 was addressed to St. Basil or to some other man bearing that name.

I confine myself here to the second of these questions, i. e. to that of the authenticity of Letter 41, although a consideration of this involves also a consideration of Letter 40 since the two letters have common subject-matter, and the authenticity of the one, therefore, says something for the authenticity of the other.

With regard to Letter 40 Wright¹ says that its language offers evidence against its authenticity, for neither the style nor the diction is Julian's. One striking instance of peculiarity of diction noted by Professor Wright is the use of *Δάνονβα* for the Danube river. Julian always refers to it as the Ister. Wright further argues against the authenticity of this letter from the fact that Gregory of Nazianzus does not mention a demand of the Emperor Julian upon Basil for a thousand pounds of gold—a demand contained in Letter 40—, and in his denunciations of the Emperor he would scarcely have overlooked such an injustice towards his friend. This fact, however, proves little.

Relative to both Letter 40 and Letter 41 Tillemont,² back in the eighteenth century, judged them to be authentic because of what Sozomen said in the fifth century. Even if it were correct method in general for Tillemont to lean so faithfully and

¹ Wilmer Cave Wright, *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, Vol. III, New York, 1923, p. xlvi.

² M. Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, Vol. IX, p. 645, Paris, 1714.

uncritically on Sozomen's mere word, it would not be correct here, since Sozomen's reason for authenticity is obviously unconvincing. Letter 40 does not show a "depth of learning"—in Tillemont's phrase—so remarkable as to point to one only possessor. And if it did so point, it would not point inevitably to St. Basil, who was learned but who was surpassed by contemporaries on this score. Moreover, Letter 40 is written as to a person of influence at Caesarea; and in 362, the date of Julian's visit to that district, Basil had not yet been ordained presbyter, and was not in Caesarea.³ Consequently, such a letter would scarcely have been written to him. Then, too, according to Bessières,⁴ while Letter 40 and Letter 41 hold a prominent place in Families Bo, Bu, and Bz, the three most unreliable families of manuscripts, they are completely lacking in Family Ab, and occur in Family Aa only in Parisinus 334 S, a manuscript of the sixteenth century, and in a recent addition at the end of Marcianus 61 and of Baroccianus 121. This would suggest, as Bessières infers, that they were introduced late in the manuscripts, probably in the Family Aa first, and then, on account of the authority of the Family Aa, were incorporated into the other families.

Having myself examined the language of the Letters of St. Basil recognized as authentic, and applying the results of this study to Letter 41, I have noted the following peculiarities pertinent to the question of the authenticity of the Julio-Basilian Correspondence. In the use of the reflexive pronouns of the first and second persons singular in his authentic letters, Basil prefers the forms of the first and second person. *ἴαυτοῦ* is used for *ἐμαυτοῦ* only six times, in comparison with one hundred and six occurrences of *ἐμαυτοῦ*. Similarly, for the second person, *ἴαυτοῦ* takes the place of *σεαυτοῦ* nineteen times, while *σεαυτοῦ* occurs seventy-four times.⁵ In Letter 41, the form *ἴαυτοῦ* is employed for both *ἐμαυτοῦ* and *σεαυτοῦ*, which do not occur.

Again, in indirect discourse Basil seems to avoid the use of

³ P. Maran, *Vita S. Basilii Magni*, Benedictine ed. of St. Basil's works, Vol. 3, p. lxxv.

⁴ M. Bessières, *La tradition des Lettres de S. Basile*, p. 164, Oxford, 1923.

⁵ Sister Agnes Clare Way, *The Language and Style of the Letters of St. Basil*, Washington, 1927, p. 7.

ώς and the finite verb in his authentic letters and prefers the use of the infinitive. Only about twelve examples of ὡς introducing indirect discourse occur in all his authentic letters.⁶ In Letter 41 three examples of indirect discourse are found, all of which are introduced by ὡς. Although these forms appear in the letters of St. Basil, yet they are quite exceptional.

Furthermore, certain discrepancies between Letter 41 and the undoubtedly letters of Basil in the use of titles strengthen the suspicions as to the authenticity of Letter 41, suggested by the preceding paragraph. Among the terms of address found in Letter 41, γαληνότατε and γαληνότης both appear. Neither of these titles occurs in the authentic letters. In itself, this discrepancy is not a condemnation of the letter, since several titles are found in Basil's letters but once. However, the word εὐτελέστατος occurs here as a title of assumed humility and in the authentic letters no other word except ταπείνωσις is found as such a title. The use of τήμερον also seems suspicious. In the authentic letters this word occurs three times, but in the form σήμερον, not τήμερον, viz., CXXX 222 E, CLV 224 B, and CCXXIV 343 C.⁷ The form τήμερον never occurs in the letters recognized as authentic.

To be taken in conjunction with the above is the fact that the language of the letter, although treating materials common to the undoubtedly Basilian letters, bears no trace of peculiarly Basilian phraseology, a significant fact certainly in view of the uniformity of expression characteristic of the correspondence of this busy man, a characteristic not affected by the eminence of the person addressed.

In conclusion, then, the tests that can be applied to Letter 41 on the score of diction seem to reinforce a growing tendency of scholarship, based on the scores of subject-matter and manuscript tradition, to consider the letter unauthentic.

Sister AGNES CLARE WAY, C.D.P.

OUR LADY OF THE LAKE COLLEGE,
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.

⁶ Ibid., p. 37.

⁷ Ibid., p. 171.

LIVY AND FESTUS ON THE TRIBUS PUPINIA.

[The *tribus Pupinia* seems to have lain north of the Anio and nearer to Rome than the *Crustumina* and *Claudia*.]

Scaliger's freehanded emendation of some broken lines of Festus (264, L) has led to a series of errors regarding the *Pupinia* *tribus*. The fragments with Scaliger's padding read:

< *Pupinia tribus* >
ab agri nomine < dicta qui *Pupinius* dicitur inter >
Tusculum urbem < que situs >
minit *invictum* < >

Nissen (*Ital. Landesk.* II, 564), Ashby (*Papers Brit. Sch. Rome*, I, 224) and Tomassetti (*La Campagna Romana*, III, 398), follow the tradition created by Scaliger in placing the *Pupinia* between *Tusculum* and Rome. But it is of course unwise to rest arguments upon conjectured readings, and there are several conceivable ways of construing both *Tusculum* and *urbem* without assuming *inter*. This restoration therefore cannot be used in an attempt to determine the location of *Pupinia*. It is also possible that Festus here condensed a passage of Verrius that was based upon Livy XXVI, 9, 12 (inde *Algido Tusculum petiit* (*Hannibal*), nec *receptus moenibus, infra Tusculum dextrorsus Gabios descendit*. Inde in *Pupiniam exercitu demisso, octo milia passuum ab Roma posuit castra*). Being ignorant of geography Festus may here, as so often elsewhere, have left a misleading fragment of his original. In the passage of Livy just cited *Pupinia* is thought of as lying north of the Anio, for both Polybius (IX, 5, 9, and 7, 2) and Livy XXVI, 11, 1 are clear on the point that a few days later Hannibal had to cross the Anio on coming near to Rome. In fact Livy's epitome says *super Anienem*. Hannibal had apparently marched northward past *Gabii* on the old road that crosses the Anio at Lunghezza and encamped near modern Settecamini. The reason why this passage of Livy has not been properly utilized is doubtless the general skepticism of scholars about the accuracy of Livy's account of Hannibal's route. But now that De Sanctis (*Storia dei Rom.* III, 2, 337) has vindicated the whole narrative by

proving its agreement with Polybius we may give the passage its due. We may add that Livy, in IX, 41, 10 (see Weissenborn's note) also implies that Pupinia was on the northern side of the Anio, for in that passage Decius is said to retreat southward from Etruria towards Rome before a threatened raid of Etruscans. Presumably Decius took his stand north of Rome where he could protect the city.

This location of Pupinia is supported by several passages that speak of the ager Pupiniensis as being notoriously the least fertile land near the city (Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II, 96; Varro *R. R.* I, 9, 5; Columella I, 4, 3; Val. Max. IV, 4, and 8, 1). There can be little doubt that the Travertine plain near Bagni east of Lunghezza on the Tiburtine road best answers to this description. Here are about 7000 acres of the thinnest and least fruitful soil of Latium, and in this district there are now very few traces of Roman habitation. The Pupinia tribus must of course have covered more than this waste district, which runs eastward from about the tenth mile from Rome, but the unfruitful portion was at least a large enough fraction of the ager to give a bad reputation to the whole area of the tribus. It was the home of two of Rome's sturdiest heroes, Atilius Regulus and Fabius Maximus, both as poor as they were honest. The tribus seems to have lain north of the Anio and nearer to Rome than the Crustumina and Claudia.

The location of this ager north of the river Anio ought to be of some interest to students of Livy since he has been accused of confusing his account in speaking only of Hannibal's recrossing the Anio but saying not a word about the first crossing. But certainly, if all his readers knew that Pupinia was north of the river there was no need of mentioning the first crossing, since that was implied in giving the precise location of the camp. There are many instances of misplaced criticism of Livy based upon ignorance of what he has actually said.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, LXXVI (1927).

Pp. 1-13. Christian Jensen, Menanderstudien. I. Der Anfang des vierten Aktes der *Epitrepones*. Cairo papyrus, leaf Z^{1, 2}, published by Lefèvre and assigned by Sudhaus to the *Epitrepones*, has been correctly placed by Robert and Schwartz at the beginning of the fourth act. It stood between the leaves Y and H and was the first leaf of a new quaternion. The *recto* of Z^{1, 2} preceded the *verso*. The fourth act probably began with the first verse of Z¹. Smicrines' speech did not end at Z² 11, and may have occupied the remainder of the page. Following Z² is a lacuna of about seventy verses (the missing Z^{3, 4}). In this lacuna there was a monologue delivered by Pamphile after the departure of her father and before the entrance of Habronon. However, this did not fill the whole lacuna, but was preceded by a speech in which Pamphile refuses the demands of her father (possibly that she contract a new marriage with a wealthy man). It is probable that the *þños* of the Didot papyrus, listed by Nauck [T. G. F.⁹ (1889)] as *frag. incert.* 953 of Euripides, is this missing speech, as is suggested by Robertson, Cl. Rev. 36 (1922), 106 ff. Jensen has decided to include the *þños* in the *Epitrepones* for his edition of Menander now in manuscript.

Pp. 14-19. Robert Vöpel, Zum Schauspielerproblem. It was not due to economy that the ancients limited the number of actors to three or four. The cause is to be sought in the peculiar manner in which drama was produced, in the *agon*. Every contest implies a certain equality. In the theatrical contests Vöpel finds that equality, at least for several dramas (Seneca 6; Sophocles 1; Euripides 4; Aristophanes 1), in the length of the rôles of two or more actors. In some cases the protagonist (I.) is assigned exactly or approximately the same number of verses as the deuteragonist (II.). In other plays Vöpel finds II. = III.; I. = II. + III.; I. = III.; or I. = II. = III.

Pp. 20-53. Konrat Ziegler, Plutarchstudien. IV. Noch einmal der 'Brief des Lamprias.' The letter is an improvisation of an anonymous author of at least the fourteenth century. He was probably influenced by Plin. Epist. 3, 5, 1. V. Zur Geschichte des Seitenstettensis (cf. Rh. Mus. 68, 109). Oral tradition of the history of the MS. VI. Erläuterungen zu Band III 2 der Biographien. Notes on fifty-eight passages. Note on punctuation.

Pp. 54-101. Friedrich Thedinga, Die Paraenese in des Porphyrios Schrift Περὶ ἀποχῆς ἐμψύχων. In all four books of Por-

phyrios' work appear sections which, according to style, must have been taken from a paraenetic work on the same theme. This work was that of a Neoplatonist, probably Numenius. Translations of 1, 27-57; 2, 37-46 and 49-52; 4, 20 (p. 264, 2-266, 13N.) ; 3, 26 (l. 25 = p. 222N.)-27.

Pp. 102-105. Conrad Cichorius, Der Astrologe Ti. Claudius Balbillus, Sohn des Thrasyllus. Cichorius seeks to identify a Ti. Claudius Balbillus, mentioned in a papyrus published by H. Idris Bell (*Jews and Christians in Egypt*, London 1924), with the astrologer Ti. Claudius Balbillus, appointed *praefectus Aegypti* by Nero in 55. This Balbillus was the son of Thrasyllus, who was also an astrologer and friend of Tiberius. A restored inscription (Wiegand, *Forschungen in Ephesus* 3, 128) seems to prove that Balbillus spent the last days of his life in Ephesus.

Pp. 106-112. J. Weidgen, Zum Thukydidestext. I. Notes on nineteen passages of the first book.

Pp. 113-137. H. v. Arnim, Die Echtheit der Grossen Ethik des Aristoteles. A defence by v. Arnim of his view (Wiener Sitzungsber. 202, 2) that the *Magna Moralia* is a genuine Aristotelian work, a course of lectures composed earlier than either the *Nicomachean Ethics* or the *Eudemian Ethics*, against the arguments of E. Kapp (*Gnomon* 3, 1, 19-38; 3, 2, 73-81) that the *Mag. Mor.* is an abstract of the other two works. Extended comparisons between *Mag. Mor.* and *Eud. Ethics*. Continued pp. 225-253.

Pp. 138-170. R. Helm, Hieronymus und Eutrop. An attempt to determine the source of the additions made by Jerome to the Chronicle of Eusebius. Continued pp. 254-306.

Pp. 171-197. W. Judeich, Athen und Theben vom Königsfrieden bis zur Schlacht bei Leuktra. A general account of the relations between Athens and Thebes during this period. For special consideration are singled out: the account of the assassination of the polearchs at Thebes (Dec. 379), and of the consequent breaking of the treaty between Athens and Sparta (with reference to the theory of Grote); the attempt of Sphodrias on the Piraeus (378 B. C.); the short-lived peace between Athens and Sparta in 374 B. C. and its relation to the peace of 371 B. C.; Athens' policy toward Thebes after Leuctra. There is an excursus dealing with the strategy and tactics of the battle of Leuctra.

Pp. 198-204. Th. Birt, Was heisst *βασιλεύς*? Was heisst *dictator*? The suffix *-eūs* was used to form either proper names (as *'Αχιλλεύς*) or nouns denoting a calling or vocation (as *ἱππεύς*, *ἱερεύς*, *χαλκεύς*, etc.). A proper name *Βασίλος* exists and an adjective **βασίλος* may be assumed. Then *βασιλεύς* : **βασίλος* =

ποκιλεύς : *ποκίλος*. *Βασίλος* and **βασίλος* are related to *βάζειν*. **βασίλος* = 'eloquent', *βασιλεύς* = 'speaker by calling', 'spokesman'. The meaning of *dictator* (from *dictare*) was originally the same as that of *βασιλεύς* in Homer. His function was not originally that of a commander of troops.

Pp. 205-218. Josef Mesk, Libanios *περὶ δουλείας*. It cannot be proved that the *Περὶ δουλείας* (Libanius 25) has as its source a work of the same name by Bion Borysthenites, although it may be based on some other work of Bion or on a Cynic 'diatribe' influenced by Bion. However, it is more probable that Libanius did not follow closely any one source.

Pp. 219-224. MISZELLEN.

Pp. 219-220. J. Mesk, Zu Martial VI 14. An interrogation point should follow *Laberi* (v. 2). *Scribat* (v. 4) will then be a dubitative or deliberative subjunctive.

P. 220. C. Fries, Ad Cic. or. Phil. I 14, 35. The *omnipotestate* of manuscript Vaticanus should be emended to *omni potest aetate*.

Pp. 220-221. B. Warnecke, *Ludii barbari*. Plautus distinguishes carefully between the *histriones*, who acted in his plays, and the *ludii barbari* (Aul. 402; Curn. 150), in whom O. Immisch (*Zur Frage der Pl. Cantica*, Heidelberg 1923, p. 18) sees the exponents of the non-literary stage of the drama prior to Livius Andronicus. From Livy (5, 1, 5) we learn that long before Livius Andronicus there were native actors who belonged to the servile class, i. e. *ludii barbari*. From the second prologue of the *Hecyra* (vv. 33-36) may be seen how dangerous rivals to the *histriones* were these *ludii barbari*.

Pp. 222-224. Fridericus Marx, Critica Hermeneutica. I. In the inscription <'Απὸ τοῦ δεῖνος ἀρχοντος ἐφ' οὐ πρῶτον κῶμοι ἡσαν τῶι Διονύσῳ> (Ditt. Syll³. 1078) the word *κῶμοι* preserves the former name of the choruses in honor of Bacchus. When *χοροὶ παιδῶν* began to be produced, the title *κῶμοι* gave place to the more significant name *χοροὶ ἄνδρων*. The inscription refers to the year 509/8 B. C., in which, according to the *Marmor Parium*, *χοροὶ ἄνδρων* first competed. II. Rhet. ad Her. (4, 50, 63). For the character of the *ostentator pecuniosus* compare Ath. (6, 230C) and Theophrastus (Char. 23). III. For the style of Jerome's reference to the poet Lucretius (Chron. ad Ol. 171, 1) compare Suet. (Calig. 50, 2). The reference to Lucretius comes originally from the first part of the *Viri Illustres*, since in this work of Suetonius the order was probably: (1) *poetae*, (2) *historici*, (3) *oratores*, (4) *philosophi*.

Pp. 225-253. H. v. Arnim, Die Echtheit der Grossen Ethik des Aristoteles (cf. pp. 113-137). II. The references to Mentor

(1197b22) and to Darius (1212a5) prove the genuineness of the *Magna Moralia*. III. Theophrastus regarded the work as Aristotelian. IV. Alexander Aphrodisiensis (Top. 274, 42 Br. = Ar. frg. 113 Rose) quotes the work as being Aristotle's. V. The treatment of *ηδονή* (1204a19-1206a35) shows that the *Mag. Mor.* was the first of the three ethical treatises. VI. Criticism of the views of Kapp as a whole.

Pp. 254-306. R. Helm, Hieronymus und Eutrop (cf. pp. 138-170). After the examination of a great number of passages, Helm finds it hard to believe that Eutropius is the source of Jerome for his additions to the Chronicle of Eusebius. He is inclined to believe with Enmann (*Philologus*, Suppl. 4,489 ff.) that at one time there must have existed the corpus of a *Latina historia* dealing in biographical form with Roman history from the time of the Alban kings. It is more probable that Jerome consulted such a work than that he availed himself of many different authors.

Pp. 307-324. J. Weidgen, Zum Thukydides-text. II. Notes on forty-one passages from the first, second, and third books.

Pp. 325-336. MISZELLEN.

Pp. 325-327. C. Cichorius, Zu römischen Malern. 1. The painter, L. Mallius, of Macrobius (2, 2, 10) may be the artist who was employed by L. Aemilius Paullus (*Incensus auctor de viris illustribus* 56). 2. According to Herz (Progr. Breslau 1867) the painter of Pliny (H. N. 35, 115) is M. Plautius Lyco, an Asiatic Greek, possibly a freedman of M. Plautius, governor of Asia Minor at the beginning of the first century B. C. (cf. Inscription of Priene 121). 3. Famulus, Cornelius Pinus and Attius Priscus (Pliny H. N. 35, 120). The painter Famulus may have some connection with D. Haterius Famulus (C. I. L. 3, 7167), and through him with D. Haterius Agrippa, praetor in 15, consul in 22. Cornelius Pinus and Attius Priscus are possibly to be connected respectively with the L. Cornelius Pinus of C. I. L. 6, 16239 and the Attius of C. I. L. 6, 12745.

Pp. 327-329. C. Cichorius, Ein Bündnisvertrag zwischen Rom und Knidos. The date of the treaty in the inscription found in Chalcis in 1899 (cf. *'Αθηνῶν* 11, 283; *Mélanges Cagnat* 1912; *Nachträge zu Täublers Imperium Romanum*, p. 450 f.) is 45 B. C.

Pp. 329-331. C. Cichorius, Dakische Kriegsmaschinen auf der Trajanssäule. The military engines shown on the column of Trajan as defending a Dacian fortress, are of Thracian origin and are not the inventions of Roman engineers in the service of the Dacians.

Pp. 331-335. H. Draheim, Die Zahl der Tage in der Ilias. A note on the structure of the original Iliad.

Pp. 335-336. Fridericus Marx, Isocola puerilia. In spite of the assertion (*Rhet. ad Her.* 4, 20, 27 = p. 136, 16 edit. 1923) that the figure *isocolon* 'non denumeratione nostra fiet—nam id quidem puerile est—sed tantum adferet usus et exercitatio facultatis, ut animi quodam sensu par membrum superiori referre possimus,' we learn that Isocrates was ridiculed for his counting of syllables (*Plut. de glor. Athen.* 8, 350E). Cf. also Lucian (*Ver. Narrat.* 1, 5) and Apuleius (*Met.* 6, 2) for parodies of the figure.

Pp. 337-346. Otto Immisch, Zu Theokrits Kyniska. Theocritus 14 is probably based on Sophron, but this cannot be proved by any of the extant fragments of Sophron. However, the 'pale Pythagorean' of v. 5 is said by the scholiast to have referred to Plato. If this is true, then Sophron may have introduced into one of his mimes a sportive reference to one of Plato's visits to Sicily, and this would be the source of Theocritus. II. In vv. 16 and 17 read: *σχεδὸν ὡς ἀπὸ λανῶ! βολβός τις κολχᾶς ἐξαιρέθη!* and give these words to Thyonichus. *Κολχᾶς* is an adj. = 'kolchisch' = 'poisonous' (in view of the myth of Medea). Then *βολβός τις κολχᾶς* = *βολβὸς ἄγριος* or *τὸ Κολχικόν*, a poisonous plant sometimes called *ἔφημερος*. Thyonichus interrupts Aeschinias' praise of his own wine with the disparaging exclamation, "(An *οἶνος* ὑβριστής) hardly out of the wine press! It was pure poison you served up!"

Pp. 347-374. J. Weidgen, Zum Thukydides-text. III. Notes on fifty-six passages of the fourth, fifth, and sixth books.

Pp. 375-393. Karl Busche, Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung der Verrinen. Discussion of the views of Peterson and Klotz as to the MSS. Notes on twenty-two passages from five orations.

Pp. 394-417. Ernst Bickel, Ps.-Tertullian *De execrandis gentium diis*. Latin text with textual notes. The work is not by Tertullian, but is probably by an apologete of about the sixth century. Bickel investigates the sources of the legal, mythological, religious, and chronological statements of the treatise.

Pp. 418-432. Hans Herter, De Mutino Titino. Herter thinks that the worship of Priapus was brought from Alexandria to Italy at a very early period. However, at this time the Italians already had an ithyphallic god, Mutinus Titinus. The earliest form of the first part of the name was probably *Moetinus* (*Lucil. 78M.*). Festus wrote *Mutinus Titinus*; Varro either *<Mutinus> Titinus* or *Mutunus Tutunus*. The root *mut* is that of *muto* (*mutonium*). Mutinus is, therefore, a *deus mutationatus* =

magno mutone instructus, qui mutonis actibus praesideret. The form later changed to *Mutunus*. The oldest form of the second part of the name is *Titinus*. There was originally no phallic signification present in the word. *Titinus* was probably at first a *gentilicius deus*, a *deus Titiorum* (or *Titiniorum*). Thus *Mutinus* derived his cognomen from the *Titii* just as *Minerva Matusia* derived hers from the *Matusii*. However, *Titinus* was probably at first a god *sui iuris*, and only later, but still at an early period, connected with *Mutinus*. Later, when the connection with the *Titii* was forgotten, the god came to be called *Tutinus*. Lenormant (Rev. num. 1838, p. 11 sq.) and others are possibly right in thinking that the head on the denarius coined by Q. Titius about 90 B. C. and restored by Trajan may be that of *Mutinus Titinus*.

Pp. 433-448. MISZELLEN.

Pp. 433-439. Eduard Schwyzer, Die 'lex regia' über den vom Blitz erschlagenen. In the law of Numa Pompilius (Festus, p. 178M. = p. 190, 5 sqq. L.), *si hominem fulminibus occisit, ne supra genua tollito*, the reading is correct. *Occisit* is impersonal in the sense that its subject is some unnamed higher power. The *ne supra genua tollito* is to be taken literally. The body was not to be raised from the ground higher than the knees, and, since the burial ritual required the raising and carrying out of the dead, the law really forbids a private burial.

Pp. 440-446. Eduard Schwyzer, Impomenta. *Impomenta* (Paul. ex Festo, p. 108, 18M. = 96, 14L.) is from **impo-menta* = **in-po-si-menta* (cf. *po-si-nō*, *posnō*, *ponō*). Discussion of certain irregularities of the formation.

Pp. 446-448. Fridericus Marx, De Galatonis tabula. Ael. Var. Hist. 13, 22: Γαλάτων δὲ ὁ ζωγράφος ἔγραψε τὸν μὲν Ὄμηρον αὐτὸν ἐμοῦντα, τὸν δὲ ἄλλους ποιητὰς τὰ ἐμημερένα ἀρνομένους. Marx quotes numerous Greek and Latin authors to prove that in this passage *ἐμοῦντα* is used in a figurative sense, and closes with the remark: *Nempe haurire poetas ex Homero hodieque audimus dici.*

Pp. 449-452. Register.

ROBERT PARVIN STRICKLER.

SOUTHWESTERN, MEMPHIS.

ROMANIA, Vol. LIV (1928) janv.-avril.

Pp. 1-10. Luigi Suttina. Frammento di un nuovo canzoniere provenzale del sec. XIII. This fragment of a single leaf has recently been discovered in the archives of Udine in Italy. It was no doubt originally part of a valuable manuscript collection of poems belonging to some book lover or library in the thirteenth century. The fragment found embraces the nearly complete text of three poems and portions of two others all by the celebrated troubadour Bernart de Ventadorn. A facsimile of the best preserved portion of the leaf found is accompanied by the publication of the text of the whole.

Pp. 11-65. Am. Pàgès. Poésies provençal-catalanes inédites du manuscrit Aguiló. In recent years this manuscript has been preserved in Palma de Mallorca by Estanislau Aguiló, who discovered it in a somewhat dilapidated condition some years ago. It is a collection of poems copied in the fourteenth century, which has been partially known to scholars through previous publications. In this first article a critical edition is given of *La Vesio* de Bernat de So written in the "limousine" dialect some time before the year 1385, when a tablet was erected to his memory at Perpignan. An analysis of this long poem shows that it was written under the impression of the wars which desolated Europe towards the end of the century in question by a scholarly knight who had taken part in them.

Pp. 66-98. Richard T. Holbrook. Pour le commentaire de *Maistre Pierre Pathelin*. Premier article. Ever since the year 1904 the author has been devoting much time to the study of this early masterpiece, whose difficulties of interpretation have hitherto prevented any modern scholar from attempting to publish a complete critical edition. Despite his earlier attempts in this field with their well-merited success, he again offers further suggestions as to the meaning of certain obscure passages of this well-known text.

Pp. 99-109. C.-A. Knudson, Jr. Une aventure d'Antoine de La Sale aux Iles Lipari. This recital is found in *la Salade*, a compilation of counsels for a prince, and has been previously published. But having found a new form of it in a Chantilly manuscript which was prepared under the direction of La Sale himself, the author of this article undertakes to investigate the question whether it antedates the completion of the whole work entitled *la Salade*. A critical edition of the Chantilly text is herewith given as representing the earliest known manuscript of any of the works of Antoine de La Sale.

Pp. 110-124. Mélanges.

Pp. 125-138. Comptes rendus.

Pp. 139-152. Périodiques.

Pp. 153-160. Chronique.

Pp. 161-196. Joseph Bédier. La tradition manuscrite du *Lai de l'Ombre*; réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes. Premier article. The method of classifying manuscripts which has been in vogue among modern scholars for the past hundred years or so is commonly known as the Lachmann method. It usually results in establishing a scheme with two families of manuscripts. In recent years, however, this method has been assailed by Dom Henri Quentin, the Latinist. M. Bédier in this first article endeavors to give the reader an idea of the new line of approach to this age-old problem which has been suggested for the serious consideration of the scholarly world. The basic principle of logic involved is that when two given manuscripts of a text never agree in opposition to a third manuscript, this latter manuscript is intermediate between them. Variant readings from the seven known manuscripts of the *Lai de l'Ombre* are copiously used by Dom Quentin and M. Bédier to illustrate this principle, and the new classification arrived at by the former is given as the final result of this new investigation of an old question made by Dom Quentin.

Pp. 197-248. Am. Pagès. Poésies provençal-catalanes inédites du manuscrit Aguiló. II. Nouvelles rimées de Jacme et de Pere March. Towards the close of the fourteenth century the success attained by the Breton legends in Northern France influenced very largely the literary efforts of writers in Southern France and Northern Spain. Thus we find the two brothers mentioned above writing both in Catalan and Provençal on subjects from the North. The present article gives a critical edition of five of their poems which were written in Catalan.

Pp. 249-260. A. Graur. Les substantifs neutres en roumain. Roumanian is the only one of the Romance languages that has neuter substantives, which it has developed independently out of the Latin neuter. Being unhampered by a preceding linguistic tradition, it has gone further than the Latin ever did, and has also endeavored to assimilate words from other foreign languages to its own system of genders.

Pp. 261-273. Mélanges.

Pp. 274-296. Comptes rendus.

Pp. 297-306. Périodiques.

Pp. 307-320. Chronique.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

REVIEWS.

A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome. By S. B. PLATNER, completed and revised by THOMAS ASHBY. Oxford University Press, 1929. Pp. 608.

This book, so eagerly awaited by all scholars interested in Roman studies, does not disappoint expectations. Before his death in 1921 Platner had completed most of the articles with the thoroughness, precision and the sense of balance that characterized his work. For his collaborator, Thomas Ashby, he had reserved the articles on aqueducts, gates and roads, and to him also fell a number of articles on sites in the Forum and on the Palatine which had been deferred for a renewed examination. The reader soon finds that Mr. ASHBY has very conscientiously examined all the excavations and publications of the later years up to 1928 and has in the light of these revised a very large number of the articles. Mr. ASHBY has estimated his own part as being "20 to 25 percent of the book," but since he had to assume the heavy responsibility of giving the final decision on all the moot questions—and they are of course very many—percentages of space will hardly express the great debt that we owe to the revising editor. Moreover, Mr. ASHBY's intimate acquaintance with the excavations of the Palatine, which have not yet been published—Comm. Boni gave Mr. ASHBY unusual privileges there—, his long study of such architectural puzzles as the Pantheon, which beget new theories every year, his accurate observations, made through a lifetime, of many objects no longer visible, and his sanity of judgment and fairness to the suggestions of his various collaborators in the field, all of these factors have enabled him to produce an invaluable reference book which will be as frequently consulted by the specialists as by the beginner.

In a work as large as this, one must of course expect some statements that will encounter demurrer. *Maximus* apparently stands for *Flamininus* on p. 252, and in the same article—on Hercules Custos—it might have been well to delete the comment that "the masonry . . . has been attributed to the fourth century," since the structure must date somewhere near 100 B. C. And as this is a building which promises to overturn some current notions about the date of republican concrete, it might have been in place to give a careful description of the materials. Among the houses, the *domus* of Q. Caecilius Metellus should have been included, with references to Cic. pro Cael. 59 and pro Milone 75; and to the one reference to the Palatine property of Q. Cicero one might add Cic. ad Att. II, 4, 7. Some readers will

also wish that the authors had tried to clarify a little further the maze that Vagliari left on the Cermalus near the Scalae Caci, and the equally confusing disarray that Boni uncovered near the old rostra. Line drawings of the remains with explanatory notes might well have been given here since the book is otherwise so richly illustrated.

The authors are usually conservative, and rightly so, but when one still finds the very early conventional dates assigned to the masonry arches in front of Saturn and to all the cappellaccio walls of the Quirinal one wonders whether they have not held too tenaciously to views published thirty years ago. On the other hand in assigning an unusual amount of building activity to Sulla the authors have yielded to rather intrepid conjecture. There does not seem to be evidence for the list given on pp. 232-3, and several of the structures can be proved not to belong to the period of Sulla's dictatorship. Lundström's new studies in topography did not appear in time to receive appraisement in this volume, nor Bartoli's optimistic report on the recent excavations on the Palatine. One would appreciate Mr. ASHBY'S expert opinion on both of these.

But any attempt to criticize this Dictionary is in danger of detracting unfairly from the value of a very remarkable book. No classical scholar can afford to disregard it, for it supersedes not only the pertinent articles of our classical encyclopedias, but also those of our books on Roman topography. Whether one is studying Roman archaeology, or Roman history, or the works of Cicero, Plautus, Livy, Ovid, Tacitus, Juvenal and Martial, this Dictionary is absolutely necessary.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Chaucer and the Roman Poets. By EDGAR FINLEY SHANNON.

Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, Vol. VII.

Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press, 1929.

This book, begun as a dissertation at Harvard University, has attained the measure of a definitive study of the influence on Chaucer of certain Roman poets. Its striking contribution to the field of comparative literature is the convincing proof that Chaucer was indebted to "Venus clerk, Ovyde" not only in his early works, but throughout his career as a poet.

This is not a new theme, for in the seventeenth century, John Dryden in a brilliant essay, his "Preface to the Fables," made a famous comparison between Chaucer and Ovid in regard to style, subject matter and character drawing, which is still the point of departure for all comparative study of the two poets. Mr. Shannon, after acknowledging his debt to Dryden, to

Lounsbury, Skeat, J. Koch, and to Professor Kittredge, his inspiration, proceeds to his *opus magnum* with the laborious patience of the Matinian bee. Two recent brief essays along the lines of this work ("Ovid and Romance," by S. G. Owen, in "English Literature and the Classics," Oxford 1912, and "Imprints of the *Heroides* of Ovid on Chaucer, the Legend of Good Women," by Willard Connely, in *Classical Weekly*, XVIII, (1924)) had only suggested the possibilities of studies in comparative literature for Chaucer and Ovid.

Mr. Shannon, taking up Chaucer's poems in chronological order, combines in his criticism a summary of all details of allusion and borrowing in language, subject matter and spirit, with some general comparisons of the qualities of the two poets which extend Dryden's appreciative dicta. He traces the change from Chaucer's early acquaintance with Ovid through the French romances to his first-hand knowledge of the poet after his visits to Italy, outlining his obvious debt in the earlier poems and showing more subtle debts in character drawing and narrative style than have been estimated before. One example of his new suggestions is the inspiration of "Anelida and Arcite" from the *Heroides*, to which Chaucer himself probably refers in saying that he is following here "Corinne," a name known to be given to the "Amores" of Ovid and possibly therefore to a volume containing all his amatory verse. Another illustration of his general constructive criticism is his study of Dido in the "House of Fame," a demonstration that the facts of Dido's story are taken from Vergil but her character and spirit from Ovid's *Heroides* VII. He suggests plausibly also that the source for Chaucer's new treatment of Criseyde is the Helen of Ovid's *Heroides* XVI. The great debt of "The Legend of Good Women" to the *Heroides* and the lesser but appreciable debt of the "Canterbury Tales" to the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* are carefully traced.

One could wish at the end of the chronological study of Chaucer's indebtedness, a more general illustration of the English poet's methods of using Ovid: the perfect and almost literal translation of the story of Lucretia from the *Fasti* II. 721-852, in "The Legend of Good Women" V; the reminiscent interweaving of Ovid's descriptions of the House of Daedalus and the cave of the God of Sleep in Chaucer's "House of Fame"; the combination of Ovid's character sketches of Hypsipyle and Medea (*Heroides* VI, XII, *Met.* VII) in Chaucer's Medea, "The Legend of Good Women" IV, with the English poet's other sources, Guido and Valerius Flaccus. These passages illustrating close translation of narrative, reminiscent phraseology in description, and transfer of types of character in the Medea (as also in the Dido of "The House of Fame") offer striking illustrations of the varied technique for which Chaucer was indebted to Ovid's narrative style.

One value of Mr. Shannon's careful work is that it leads the student on to generalizations supported by the facts presented. To me the two poets stand out as amazingly alike yet as different as their countries and the race qualities of Italian and Saxon. A hotter sun warms Ovid's pages. A more open acceptance and expression of sex problems appear in his work. A greater wealth of imagery, a greater voluminousness of vocabulary gush forth in his stories. Ovid is a Grecized Roman in the Augustan Age until in the *Fasti* he pulls himself back to his country's gods. Chaucer seems a Romanized Saxon after his Italian sojourns, but he too reverted to themes of his own country and the neighbors at his door. Ovid's greatest work, in which he appeared as the perfect *raconteur*, is the one in which he was most Greek, the *Metamorphoses*; Chaucer's greatest work, in which he is the prince of English story-tellers, is the one in which he was most Saxon, the "Canterbury Tales." But here too as well as in his earlier poems, his brilliant narrative style, his facility and fluency, his character drawing owed something to his Latin forerunner.

The rest of Mr. Shannon's book in which he traces certain allusions in Chaucer to Statius, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Claudian, Horace, Juvenal, Persius and Catullus has its value, but the vital contribution of his volume to the study of comparative literature is the indisputable place which he has assigned to Ovid in the development of Chaucer's art.

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

Menandri Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Servatae, edidit
CHRISTIANUS JENSEN. Berlin, Weidmann, 1929, lxxvi +
184 pp.

This splendid book is the first volume of the new Weidmann Supplementary Library of Greek and Latin authors (*Bibliothecae Graecae et Latinae Auctarium Weidmannianum*). The general editors, Edward Fraenkel and Otto Regenbogen, announce in a foreword a policy of sponsoring editions of classical authors to supply gaps existing in other libraries. They do not propose to compete with such series as the Teubner, but to supplement them.

In the case of Menander the need was real, for the Teubner edition is dated 1912 and has long been out of print. The present editor has a unique claim, moreover, to speak with authority where the readings of Menander papyri are concerned, and he is able in many cases to add new suggestions of his own. In addition to the fragmentary plays he includes also the Oxyrhynchus Summaries published by Grenfell and Hunt in

1914 and the forty-four verses of the Didot papyrus, which Robertson proposed¹ to assign to the Epitrepones, and which are generally credited to Menander.

The editor's Latin preface provides very full information about the sources of the text and excellent summaries of the plots of the plays. The bibliographies do not profess to be complete, but they omit little or nothing of importance. The notes deal very fully with the text; occasionally references are given on other points. An Index Vocabulorum by Ludovicus Weckel, which is somewhat fuller than preceding ones, completes a work that is admirable for accuracy and scholarship. It appears, moreover, in a format that is a delight to hand and eye.

The editor of Menander must make up his mind how far he will attempt to produce a readable text and how far he will adopt the self-denying ordinance of rejecting all supplements that do not square with the traces and gaps of the papyri. Jensen prefers to leave blanks in many places where other editors have not been so squeamish. The fact that he is chiefly intent on following the papyrus probably accounts among other things for his failure to note that his correction of Capps' ἀπέγνωκας σὺ γὰρ to ἀλλ' ἔγνωκας σύ γε at Perikeiromene 322 will not scan. The critical notes are rather arbitrarily selected in some cases to confirm the reading of Jensen's text. Thus it will not be possible to rely solely on them for evidence. For instance at Samia 103 he cites as Sudhaus' a reading not published, I believe, by that scholar, which supports Jensen's τοῦτο rather than the φῆσι which Sudhaus actually printed and supported. Again at Perik. 136 he prints οὐ φυγεῖν ἐκοῦσαν and indicates in his note that there is room in the papyrus for nine letters before κ. Contrast his earlier statement² 'desunt septem tantum litterae,' which led me to suggest³ οὐκ ἔαν ἤκουσαν.

I take the opportunity of making a new suggestion and of revising two earlier ones of mine. Perik. 111, read ἔξητασε. Jensen allows the word but seven letters, and Glycera might well scrutinize her brother after embracing him. Samia 104, read οἴδα γὰρ ἀκριβῶς ταῦτα καὶ πέρα, τέκνον. Compare Aristophanes Aves 416, ἀπιστα καὶ πέρα κλύειν. Samia 266, read ἔξ ἀνάγκης ἐστὶ γάρ. NI. τὰ πολλά. γῆμον. ΔΗ. νοῦν ἔχεις. There is still room for an annotated edition of the rest of Menander on the scale of Wilamowitz' Epitrepones.

L. A. POST.

HARVARD COLLEGE,
HAVERFORD, PA.

¹ *The Classical Review* (1922) 36, p. 106.

² *Rheinisches Museum* (1910) 65, p. 569.

³ *The Classical Quarterly* (1929) 23, p. 210.

Studien zu Martial. Literarhistorische und Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. VON OTTO WEINREICH. Stuttgart, 1928. Verlag von W. Kohlhammer. Pp. x + 183.

Dr. Weinreich is a scholar given wholeheartedly to minute and painstaking research. His *Die Distichen des Catull* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1928) treated seven elegiac couplets of Catullus in some 110 pages of illustrative parallels and learned commentary. The present *Studien*, which comprise the fourth volume of the *Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, display a similar spirit and method.

As the subtitle indicates, it is the content more than the form of Martial's verse that is dealt with in these expansive studies. Part I (pp. 1-73) is devoted to several problems or topics furnished by the *Liber Spectaculorum*: twenty pages to prove, from detailed comparison with Greek tradition and with others of his epigrams, that Martial in the introductory poem conceived of an orthodox hebdomady of world wonders, not of five only; five pages to show that the concluding couplet of the book, 32 (31), is only a fragment, not complete in itself; a few more pages to uphold, against the thesis of A. Dau, the credibility of the early date (the reign of Titus) for the *Liber Spectaculorum*; and the remainder to discuss at some length the mythological spectacles and comparisons mentioned in the epigrams of this book—Pasiphae, Mars and Venus, Prometheus, Orpheus, Hero and Leander, the death and apotheosis of Hercules, the rape of Europa, the birth of Bacchus. The section devoted to Hercules and Europa is the longest and concludes with an ingenious conjecture that there once stood between epigrams 15 and 16 another poem (15b), now lost, that dealt specifically with the fiery death of Hercules.

Part II (pp. 74-160) is even richer in accumulated commentary. It concerns itself for the most part with those epigrams of Martial in which various animals intuitively acknowledge the *numen* of the emperor Domitian (*norunt cui servant*)—the *pius elephas* (Sp. 17), *canes* and *dammae* (Sp. 29; IV 35, 74; XIII 94), *leones* and *lepores* (I 6, 14, 22, 48, 51, 60, 104; II 75; IX 71), *psittacus* (XIV 73), *anser* (IX 31), *sacri pisces* (IV 30). The Greek Anthology supplies much of the illustrative material. Here, again, the author makes room for an occasional speculation or an opinion on some disputed problem. He believes, for example, that the wording of I 104 shows it to be a recapitulation of the other (and therefore earlier) animal poems of Book I; that *maior charta minorque* of I 44.2 represent two *books* of epigrams, not two *epigrams* (as some, like Birt and Gilbert, have believed); that the *minor charta* (i. e. *libellus*) appeared before the publication of Book I and con-

tained only the lion-hare epigrams of this book (a very tiny *libellus* indeed!); that the couplet I 45 is not a separate epigram but the conclusion of I 44.

Appendix I collects all the Greek citations appearing in Martial and reaches a conclusion that the Homeric *τὸν δ' ἀπαρεβόμενος* of I 45, which is found likewise at the end of a Greek epigram by Strabo (*A. P.* XII 4), not improbably came to Martial from the Greek epigrammatist Lukillos, though the particular epigram, not now existing, must be assumed. Appendix II, which is one of the most satisfactory studies in the book, finds in Juvenal's fourth Satire phrases equivalent to the adulatory expressions of Martial's animal epigrams and sees in this further evidence that the two poets were closely acquainted and shared kindred sentiments. The book is equipped with full indexes of subjects and cited passages.

Such a highly specialized work as this will find few and infrequent readers. The specialist who uses it will be grateful on occasion for the massed erudition which it offers, though he may question the zeal which prompted it. And he will probably be unwilling to give his assent to several of the author's interpretations and conjectures, ingenious though they be.

JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus. By A. E. TAYLOR, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. Oxford University Press (American Branch, New York), 1928. Pp. xv + 700. Price \$14.

The main purpose of this Commentary is to show that the science of the Timaeus is that of a progressive Italian Pythagorean contemporary of Socrates who was at the same time a medical man, and that the dialogue is an amalgamation of Pythagorean religion and mathematics with Empedoclean biology. Coupled with this view is the attempt to interpret the Timaeus in the light of the Academic tradition from Aristotle to Proclus, wherever it can be recovered. Whether Mr. TAYLOR has established his hypothesis, or whether there be sufficient data to establish it, may be questioned, but the attempt is most illuminating and praiseworthy. Especially commendable is the refusal to read into Plato modern subjective philosophic ideas or systems that are alien to the frank objectivity of the Greeks. Throughout some six hundred and fifty pages of notes the learning, ability and candor of the author are everywhere in evidence, and no difficulty is overlooked, while many difficulties are resolved. The notes dealing with the theories of time and space

and with the atomic and astronomical systems of the *Timaeus* as well as the exegesis of the formula *κακὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐκῶν οὐδεὶς*, are especially good. The work is intended as a Commentary on Professor Burnet's text and the few divergences therefrom are listed. A few renderings of the Greek seem over-subtle; thus at 41 A, it is hard to understand any difficulty: *θεοὶ θεῶν* on the analogy of *παιδῶν δὲ παιδεῖς* (Pindar, *Nem.* 7, 100) would seem to justify Cicero's rendering, "vos qui deorum satu orti estis" (quoted by Mr. TAYLOR), and is supported by the account, in the text just before, of the creation of the gods.

In 60 D Burnet's text is sound and should be translated: . . . "when it cools, the portion having a black color becomes a stone," the subject being *τὸ μέλαν χρῶμα ἔχον*, which is in partial opposition to the main subject, *γῆ*. In 68 C *πυρροῦ δὲ μέλανι πράσιον*, the mixture is of pigments, not lights, as is shown by the phrase preceding, *τούτοις μεμεγμένοις καυθεῖσίν τε*, and green from black and yellow is entirely possible in actual painting—in which no absolute black exists—and has been used for green flesh tints. In 74 A, *τῇ θατέρου δυνάμει*, may not the *θατέρου* refer back to *τὸ σπέρμα*, which is conceived of as the source of motion in the body? Since only two things have been mentioned in the sentence, viz. *σπέρμα* and *ἄρθρα*, *θάτερον* is the appropriate pronoun.

The book is equipped with valuable Prolegomena, indexes of personal names and of Greek words. There are also appendixes of which those on "Aristotle's Doctrine of Space" and "The Concept of Time in the *Timaeus*" are especially helpful and abreast of the science of to-day. Every student of Plato will be grateful to Mr. TAYLOR for this Commentary, nor it is too much to say: "quem quo saepius legas, plus auferas, et nunquam tamen dimittat te sine siti."

CAROL V. B. WIGHT.

Louis Jalabert et René Mouterde, S. J. *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie*. Ouvrage publié sous les auspices et avec le concours de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Tome Premier, Commagène et Cyrrhestique, Nos. 1-256. Paris, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1929. Pp. 135. Frances 75.

The plan to publish a new edition of the Greek and Latin inscriptions of Syria, to replace the collection published in 1870 by W. H. Waddington in Volume III of the Le Bas-Waddington "Voyage Archéologique," was proposed by P. Jalabert at the Congress of Athens in 1905. Three years later P. Jalabert and Professor Rudolph Brünnow agreed to divide this undertaking

between them, Jalabert with the collaboration of P. Mouterde assuming the publication of the inscriptions of Northern Syria, Brünnow the publication of the inscriptions of Southern Syria. In 1917 Professor Brünnow died, leaving his part of the new edition well advanced but still unfinished. It is hoped that under the direction of the French Academy Brünnow's work will be completed and published, as originally intended, in the series of which the first number has now appeared.

The first fascicule, beginning the series at the extreme north, in the angle formed by the Taurus Mountains and the Euphrates River, contains the inscriptions of Commagene and Cyrrhestica. There are 92 inscriptions from Commagene, including 37 from the Nemrud Dagh, 166 from Cyrrhestica, including 32 from "Balqis = Seleucia ad Euphratem = Zeugma", 4 from "Biregik = Birtha" and 50 from Aleppo and its neighborhood. Two of these, Nos. 230a and 252a were added after the numeration was complete. Forty-six inscriptions are designated as hitherto unpublished. Some of them are on seals or other portable objects in museums at 'Aintāb, Aleppo, or Beirût, in the Louvre, or in private collections such as those of MM. Poche and Marcopoli at Aleppo, and MM. Serrafian at Beirût. The publication is most useful and welcome.

The editors announced in 1926 (*Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph, Beyrouth, XI*, pp. 175-182) their expectation that the second fascicule will contain the inscriptions from the triangular region lying between the cities of Antioch, Aleppo and Hamā, together with those of the coast of North Syria, that the third fascicule will be devoted to Homs, the Nosairiyeh Mountains, Ba'albek and the Biķā' (Coele-Syria), and the fourth to Beirût and Phoenicia. Necessarily the various parts of this series, whenever published, will always be incomplete. For new inscriptions are continually being discovered, and some already found will not have been made accessible when the appropriate fascicule is issued. Moreover, in the first sentence of their "Avant-Propos", the editors disclaim the intention of publishing a "Corpus" in the modern scientific sense.

The methods adopted here for reproducing the inscriptions themselves are not always consistent and are not without certain disadvantages. No drawings, photographs or reproductions in epigraphic type are given: all the inscriptions are presented in ordinary type. A few of the longer ones, such as No. 1, are printed in lines corresponding to those of the original, but otherwise as ordinary Greek text. In most instances, however, the texts are without capitals, punctuation or sigmas of the terminal form. In some cases, as in No. 3, the necessary restorations are given in the text; but in most the emendations and restorations, even when obvious or reasonably certain, are relegated to the commentary. Where the emendation is doubtful

this procedure is to be commended; but very often it adds unnecessarily to the difficulty of studying an inscription, as, for example, in No. 208. Lastly, while the modern name of a site is always given first in the heading of the inscriptions from that place, the ancient name, if known, being added, e.g. Gerger = Arsameia, Gerabîs = Europus, yet, where the ancient name is known, this without the modern name is carried in the page-headings. Thus the page-headings contain sometimes the modern and sometimes the ancient names, causing some confusion, especially if the identification of a site is not generally recognized. The only oversight I have noticed is in connection with No. 209. This fragment "d'après estampage reçu de Pognon" is identical in wording with the end of an inscription on a lintel in Kefr Nabô and was, in my opinion, originally a part of it: the latter is reproduced in the Publications of the Princeton Expeditions to Syria, Div. III, B, No. 1173.

WILLIAM K. PRENTICE.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Ad Astra et Res multum dissonae verbis. Carmina in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano magna laude ornata. Amstelodami, Academia Regia Disciplinarum Nederlandica, 1929. 15 pp. 8°.

Agard (Walter R.). *The Greek Tradition in Sculpture*. Baltimore, Md., *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1930. 59 pp. 8°. \$3.00. (*The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology*. No. 7.)

Aiken (Janet R.). *Why English Sounds Change*. New York, *The Roland Press Co.*, 1929, vii + 146 pp. 8°. \$2.50.

Aly (Wolf). *Formprobleme der frühen griechischen Prosa*. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1929. 182 pp. 8°. Geheftet M 12, Gebunden M 14. (*Philologus, Supplementband XXI, Heft III.*)

Aristotle, *The Physics*. With an English translation by P. H. Wicksteed and F. M. Cornford.. In two volumes I. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. lxxxix + 427 pp. (*Loeb Classical Library*, No. 228.)

Arrian, *History of Alexander and Indica*. With an English translation by E. Iliff Robson. *Anabasis Alexandri I-IV*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. 1920. xvi + 450 pp. (*Loeb Classical Library*, No. 236.)

Bibliografio de Internacia Lingvo. Kompilis kaj komentaris. P. E. Stojan. Genève, *Bibliografia Servo de Universala Esperanto-Asocio*, 1929. 560 pp. 8°.

Bates (William N.). *Euripides*. Philadelphia, Pa., *University of Pennsylvania Press*, 1930. xiii + 315 pp. 8°. \$5.00.

Bergrässer (G.). *Hebräische Grammatik*. Mit Benutzung der von E. Kautzsch bearbeiteten 28. Auflage von Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräischer Grammatik. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung*, 1929. Pp. 87-182. 8°.

Boillot (Félix). *Répertoire des métaphores et mots français tirés des*

noms de villes et de pays étrangers. Paris, *Les Presses Universitaires de France*. 122 pp. 8°.

Brecht (Franz Josef). Platon und der George-Kreis. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1929. xi + 84 pp. 8°. geheftet M 4., gebunden M 5.50. (Das Erbe der Alten, Zweite Reihe, Heft XVII.)

Brenner (Clarence D.). L'Histoire nationale dans la tragédie française du XVIII^e siècle. Berkeley, Calif., 1929. (University of California publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 195-329.)

Breuning (P. S.). De Hymnorum Homericorum memoria. 130 pp. 8°. Traiecti ad Rhenum, *apud A. Oosthoek et Socios*, MCMXXIX. (Doctoral dissertation.)

Caplan (Harry). Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola on the Imagination. The Latin text, with an introduction, an English translation and notes. New Haven, Conn., *Yale University Press*, 1930. 104 pp. 8°. (Cornell Studies in English, XVI.)

Chaytor (H. J.). Six Vaudois Poems. (Text, notes, translations, glossary.) Cambridge, England, *Cambridge University Press*, 1930. xxi + 128 pp. 8°. 10s. 6d.

Ciaceri (Emanuele). Cicerone e i suoi tempi. Vol. II. Dal consolato alla morte. Roma, Società Anonima Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1930. vi + 420 pp. 8°.

Florus (Lucius Annaeus), with an English translation by E. S. Forster; Nepos (Cornelius), with an English translation by J. C. Rolfe. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. xv + 743 pp. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 231.)

Goldmann (Emil). Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache. II. Teil. Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1930. Pp. xiv + 397. M 21.

Grierson (Sir George Abraham). Linguistic Survey of India. Vol. I. Part II. Comparative Vocabulary. Calcutta, *Government of India, Central Publication Branch*, 1928. viii + 337 pp.

Groot (A. W. de). La métrique générale et le rythme. Reprint from Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris. Tome trentième, pp. 202-232. Paris, *Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion*, 1930.

Harder (Richard). Über Ciceros Somnium Scipionis. Halle (Saale), *Max Niemeyer Verlag*, 1929. Pp. 115-150. 8°. (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, 6. Jahr, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, Heft 3.)

Heisenberg (August). Zu den armenisch-byzantinischen Beziehungen am Anfang des 13. Jahrhunderts. München, *Verlag R. Oldenbourg*, 1929. 20 pp. 8°. M 1.50. (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1929, Heft 6.)

Herrlinger (Gerhard). Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung. Stuttgart, *W. Kohlhammer*, 1930. x + 188 pp. 8°. RM. 12. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft.)

Hespéris: Archives berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des Hautes-Études Marocaines, Tome VIII (1928), 3^e-4^e Trimestres. Paris, *Librairie La Rose*, 1928. Pp. 263-515. 8°. 90 francs.

Horace. Arte Poetica di Orazio. Introduzione e commento di Augusto Rostagni. Torino, *Chiantore*, 1930. Pp. cxii + 132. 12°.

Jones (Putnam Fennell). A Concordance to the Historia Ecclesiastica of Bede. Cambridge, Mass., *The Mediaeval Academy of America*, 1929. Published for the Concordance Society. ix + 585 pp. 8°.

Journal of Education (The). December 2, 1929. No. 725. Vol. 61. London, *William Rice* Pp. 845-896. Eightpence.

Kristeller (Paul Oskar). *Der Begriff der Seele in der Ethik des Plotin.* Tübingen, *J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)*, 1929. vi + 108 pp. 8°. (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte, 19.)

Laurand (L.). *Manuel des études grecques et latines. Fascicule VII. Métrique, Sciences complémentaires (Critique des textes, Paléographie, Épigraphie, Numismatique, Archéologie, Histoire de la Philologie, Bibliographie, Le Travail philologique).* 4e édition, revue et corrigée. Paris, *Auguste Picard*, 1929. Pp. 749-883.

— — —. Appendices II-IV. *L'Art oratoire des anciens, l'Enseignement du grec et du latin, Lectures de littérature grecque et latine.* Paris, *Auguste Picard*, 1929. Pp. 53-123.

— — —. Appendix V. *Petit atlas pratique d'histoire grecque et romaine.* Paris, *Auguste Picard*, 1929. 205 pp. 8°.

Livy. With an English Translation by B. O. Foster. In thirteen volumes. Vol. V, books XXI-XXII. *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. xx + 413 pp. 8°. (Loeb Classical Library No. 233.)

Marshall (F. H.). *Three Cretan Plays.* Translated from the Greek. With an introduction by John Mavrogordato. New York, N. Y., *Oxford University Press*, 1929. 338 pp. 8°. \$7.00.

Marwick (Hugh). *The Orkney Norn.* New York, N. Y., *Oxford University Press*, 1929. xlviii + 232 pp. 8°. \$7.00.

Mitteilungen des Vereines Klassischer Philologen in Wien. VI. Jahrgang. Wien, 1929. 118 pp. 8°.

Nutting (Herbert C.). *The Utor, Fruor Group. Fourth and fifth papers.* Berkeley, Calif., *University of California Press*, 1929. Pp. 63-149 and 151-168. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 10, Nos. 4 and 5.)

Ovid, *The Art of Love and other poems.* With an English translation by J. H. Mozley. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. xvi + 381 pp. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 232.)

Philological Quarterly. Vol. IX, January, 1930, No. 1. Iowa City, Iowa, *University of Iowa*, 1930. 96 pp. \$.60 per copy.

Plato with an English Translation, VII. *Timaeus, Critias, Cleitophon, Menexenus, Epistles.* By R. G. Bury. London, William Heinemann; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1929. (Loeb Classical Library, No. 234.)

Popper (William). *Abū 'L-Mahāsin Ibn Taghrī Birdī's Annals, entitled An-Nujūm az-Zâhirah fi Muṭlak Miṣr wal-Ḳâhirah,* Vol. VII, Indices and Glossary. Berkeley, Calif., *University of California Press*, 1929. (University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, Vol. 7. No. 4, pp. i-liv, 873-967.)

Reinmuth (Oscar W.). *The Foreigners in the Athenian Ephebia.* Lincoln, Nebraska, 1929. (University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature, and Criticism, No. 9.)

Rocco (Gennaro Aspreno), *Carmi latini editi ed inediti. Scelti e pubblicati con un saggio introduttivo su l'autore a cura di Nunzio Coppola.* Roma, *Società Editrice Dante Alighieri*, 1929. lvi + 372 pp. 8°.

Roth (Walter E.). *Additional Studies of the Arts, Crafts, and Customs of the Guiana Indians. With special reference to those of Southern British Guiana.* Washington, *U. S. Government Printing*

Office, 1929. xvii + 110 pp. 8°. \$1.00. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 91.)

Samuel Johnson, President of King's College: His Career and Writings. Edited by Herbert and Carol Schneider, with a foreword by Nicholas Murray Butler. Vol. I. Autobiography and Letters, xvii + 526 pp.; Vol. II. The Philosopher, viii + 603 pp.; Vol. III. The Churchman, ix + 641 pp.; Vol. IV. Founding King's College, viii + 397 pp. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1929. \$30.00 per set.

Sargeaunt (G. M.). Classical Studies. London, *Chatto and Windus*, 1929. 285 pp. 8°. 7s. 6d. net.

Schmid (Wilhelm). Untersuchungen zum gefesselten Prometheus. Stuttgart, *W. Kohlhammer*, 1929. 116 pp. 8°. RM 7.50. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Neunte Hefte.)

Sewanee Review, January-March 1930. Sewanee, Tenn., *The University of the South*. \$3.00 a year; 75 cts. a single copy.

Smith (H. R. W.). New Aspects of the Menon Painter. Berkeley, Calif., *University of California Press*, 1929. 64 pp. 8°. \$.80. (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1-64, plates 1-6, 9 figures in text.)

Stroux (Johannes). Eine Gerichtsreform des Kaisers Claudius. (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1929, Heft 8.) München, *Verlag R. Oldenbourg*. 96 pp.

Theophrastus, Metaphysics. With translation, commentary and introduction. By W. D. Ross and F. H. Fobes. New York, N. Y., *Oxford University Press*, 1929. xxxii + 87 pp. 8°. \$2.50.

Thielscher (Paul). Unser Wissen um Jesus. Ein neuer Weg der Quellenuntersuchung. I. Die Selbstentfaltung des Stoffes in den vier Evangelien. Gotha, *Leopold Klotz Verlag*, 1930. 442 pp. 8°. M. 12.

Trowbridge (Mary Luella). Philological Studies in Ancient Glass. Urbana, Ill., *University of Illinois Press*, 1928. 205 pp. 8°. \$1.50. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XIII, Aug.-Nov., 1928, Nos. 3-4.)

Vellay (Charles). Les nouveaux aspects de la question de Troie. Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1930. 131 pp. 8°.

Westermann (William Linn). Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1929. 69 pp. \$3.75.

JUL 9 1928